

168 i 1  
2  
CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

ASSERTED,

And the

Scripture-Doctrine

OF THE

TRINITY

VINDICATED:

Against a Book written by

Dr. *WATERLAND*, *h*

And entituled,

*The Importance of the Doctrine of  
the Holy Trinity asserted, &c.* *6*

---

By a Clergyman in the Country.

---

*It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks,  
Acts. XXVI. Ver. 14.*

---

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. NOON, at the *White-Hart* in  
*Cheapside* near *Mercers Chapel*. M.DCC.XXXIV.



C

A



who  
the  
the  
Com  
Lav  
T  
and  
is fo  
Dr.  
by t  
neve  
chrit





# Christian LIBERTY

ASSERTED,

And the SCRIPTURE-DOCTRINE of  
the TRINITY Vindicated.

**D**R. *Waterland* has lately publish'd a Book entitled *The Importance of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity asserted*; the Design and Purport of which Book, throughout, is to shew, that they who do not profess, or who oppose, his Notion of the Doctrine of the Trinity, ought to undergo the highest *Church-Censures*; to be deny'd *Christian Communion*; and to be farther punish'd as the Law shall think fit.

That the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, as reveal'd and declar'd *in Scripture*, is an important Doctrine, is so far from being deny'd by the Adversaries of *Dr. W's* Notion, that it is zealously contended for by them in Opposition to his Notion. And as there never was a more gross, irreligious, and Anti-christian Error promoted, instead of the real and

B

Scripture-

Scripture-Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, than that Doctrine of *Tritheism* which *Dr. W.* hath many Years been asserting and vindicating ; so there never was an Heresy more thoroughly confuted from *Scripture*, *Reason*, and the unanimous Sense of the primitive Christian Church, than this Doctrine of his, which he abusively calls *the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity*, and wou'd insinuate to be the Doctrine of the Church, has been. So that, I own, it is perfectly amazing to me, what he can mean by writing such an extravagant ill-natur'd Book, void of all Moderation, Decency, and even Modesty.

It was reasonable to expect, that the Doctrine which he pretends to be so *important* and *fundamental*, as to deserve even a Popish Authority to establish it, shou'd be some where or other express'd in Scripture ; and that he shou'd be able to set it forth in *Scripture-Terms*, that so we might, before we subscrib'd to it, or else be *Anathematiz'd* and ruin'd for not subscribing to it, be satisfy'd that it is really a Doctrine of Christ declar'd in his Gospel. And cou'd he satisfy us of this, all the Terrors of his *Church-Censures* wou'd be useless and in vain ; because every serious and real Christian wou'd of himself, and without these Menaces, immediately come into it and embrace it.

But as it is observ'd in respect of the Doctrines of *Popery*, that the Teachers of them are always most zealous for applying the wholesome tho sanguinary Laws of the Church, in Defense and Support of those Doctrines, which of all others are most absurd in themselves, and most contradictory to *Scripture* and *Reason* ; so *Dr. W.* is here playing the same Part. For tho' he has been call'd upon, over and over, to shew where his Doctrine is declar'd in *Scripture* ; and to produce either so much as *one* single Text thence, or *one* Testimony of any

any *one* Writer of the antient Church for it ; yet he has always fail'd, and must for ever fail of doing it. He has wrested Scripture (to make it speak his Sense) even to a shameful Degree, and yet he cannot make it speak it ; and he has misrepresented and perverted the Creeds and Testimonies of the Writers of the antient Church by every Art of Sophistry, unfair and unscholar-like Interpretation of their Words, in flat Contradiction to the plain and express Sense of them. And the effect has been, that the more he has been confuted in every respect, the more obstinate and angry he has been ; and when *Scripture*, *Reason*, and all *Antiquity* are shewn to be against him ; when it has been prov'd to a Degree of Demonstration, that his Notion has not the least Countenance from any of these, and that in Truth it is a meer Fiction, first brought into the Church, and begun to be promoted, towards the latter End of the fourth Century, thro' a wilful Corruption of the Doctrine of the † *Nicene* Council, and in plain Opposition to it, by such Men as *Gregory Nyssen*, *Maximus*, and a few other *Tritheists* ; and has been propagated, with other Superstitions in the Popish Church, by popish Violence and Persecution ; and has liv'd to be espous'd and refin'd by *Dr. W.* so as to appear, as will be shewn in these Papers, even shocking to a Christian ; when all this has been fully and evidently prov'd, now at last, in Defiance as it were of the common Sense of Mankind, he puts on an Air of assurance, calls his Hypothesis at Random *the Doctrine of the holy Trinity*, asserts boldly that it is *important* and *fundamental*, and to disgrace the Church with it, calls upon her to send out her Censures against all who deny or oppose it.

† See the *True Narrative of the Controversy concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity, against Dr. Berriman, P. 76—110. and Dissert. Præv. ad Novat. P. 59—70. edit. Jackson.*



If some thro' Bigotry and Want of thinking, and others thro' Indifference in Matters of Religion and want of Honesty, were not dispos'd to disregard the great and plain Doctrines of Scripture, *Dr. W's*. Hypothesis had long since been universally exploded; and there wou'd have been no Need of my taking Notice of a Book, the unreasonable and infamous Nature of which is more than a Confutation of it.

But as such a Book ought not to pass uncensur'd, I shall spend some Observations upon it.

It is, in the first Place, evident, by calling his Notion of the Trinity an *important* and *fundamental* Doctrine, that he does not at all understand what is a *fundamental* Doctrine of Religion.

As in *natural* Religion there is no *fundamental* Doctrine or Article, but which is clearly evident and demonstrable by *Reason*; so in *reveal'd* Religion there is no *fundamental* Doctrine or Article, but which is clearly express'd in *Scripture*; and which likewise by its own Nature, or the express Testimony of the Scripture itself, is declar'd to be necessary or fundamental. Therefore,

In *natural* Religion there is but *one* fundamental Article, which is fully express'd by the Apostle, [*Heb. 11. v. 6.*] *He that cometh to God (as a Worshipper of him) must believe that He is, and that He is a Rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.*

The Belief of the Existence of God and his providential Government of the World, and worshipping Him under the Expectation of a Judgment to come, is the Sum and Substance of *natural* Religion.

In the Christian reveal'd Religion there are *two* fundamental Articles, thus declar'd by our Saviour Himself; *This is Life eternal that they may know Thee (the Father) the ONLY TRUE GOD, and Jesus*  
Christ

*Christ* whom thou hast SENT, [*John* 17. v. 3.] *St. Paul* expresseth the same otherwise thus, [*1 Cor.* 8. 6.] *To us there is but ONE GOD, even the FATHER, of whom are all things. And one Lord Jesus Christ, By (Through) whom are all Things ; again, [1 Tim. 2. 5.] There is ONE GOD, and ONE MEDIATOR between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus :* And again, He sums up the whole of his preaching, and of the Christian Religion, in two Articles, namely, [*Acts* 20. v. 21.] *Repentance toward God, and Faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.*

In these two express *fundamental* Articles is included the whole both of natural Religion, and the Christian Revelation. In the *Mission* of Christ, and his being *Mediator*, is contain'd and included not only the Belief of his *Death, Resurrection* and *Ascension*, as being by God's Appointment prerequisite to his Office ; but also all the Power and Authority which God gave Him in Consequence of it. So that there was no need particularly to mention the *Mission* of the Holy Ghost and Belief in Him, because that was included in the Mediatorial Mission and Power of Christ, whom God, upon his Prayers to Him for that Purpose, [*John* 14. v. 16.] granted and authoriz'd to send the *Holy Spirit*, to be his *Minister* in the Affairs of the Church his Kingdom. On which Account our Saviour bid his Disciples *baptize all Nations in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*, (*Mat.* 28. v. 19.) And *St. Paul* (*Ephes.* 4. v. 4, 5, 6.) fully expresseth the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity in these Words ; viz. *One Spirit—One Lord—One God and Father of all, who is Above all.*

These plain Texts need no Interpretation, and are plainer in themselves than any Exposition can make them. Yet *Dr. W's.* Doctrine of the Trinity, which he calls *fundamental*, not only supposes that there are no such Texts in Scripture ; but that

the

the direct contrary to them is the *fundamental* Doctrine of the Trinity. According to his Notion, our Saviour shou'd have said ; *This is Life eternal* (not to know *Thee the Father the only true God*, but) to know the only true God, *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost* ; and *Jesus Christ, the same only true God, whom thou hast SENT*. And *St. Paul*, instead of saying, *to us* (Christians) *there is but one God*, even the *FATHER*, *OF whom are all Things*——and one *Lord Jesus Christ*, *By* (through) *whom are all things*, shou'd have said ; *to us Christians there is but one God* [not the Father, but] *the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, *OF whom are all Things* ; and one *Lord Jesus Christ, the same God*, *By* (through) *whom are all Things*. *St. Paul* distinguisheth where he shou'd not (according to *Dr. W.*) in calling the *Father* the one God of the Christians, in exprefs Contradistinction to the *Son* &c ; whereas *Dr. W.* thinks and asserts, that the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* are as much *the one God of Christians*, as the *Father* (alone by *St. Paul* declar'd to be so) is. Again, instead of saying, *there is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men* &c. he shou'd have said (in direct Contradiction) *there is one God who is Mediator between God and Men* : for that the *Son* (who was made *Flesh*) the *Man Christ Jesus*, whom *St. Paul* stiles *Mediator*, is equally, *Dr. W.* thinks, *Supreme God* with the one God and Father of all, to whom he is *Mediator*. Once more, instead of saying, *one Spirit*——*one Lord*——*one God and Father of all, who is above all*, the Apostle ought, according to *Dr. W.*, to have included the *one Spirit* and *the one Lord* in the *one God*, and not to have distinguish'd the *one God* from them by the personal Appellation of *Father of all, who is above all* ; as if he was eminently and peculiarly the *one God* more than, or above, the *Son* and *Spirit*.



Dr. W. cannot, I am sure, with Truth or Justice say, that I have in the least misrepresented his Notion of the Sense of the preceeding Texts of Scripture, who every where declares *the one God of Christians* (whom St. Paul styles *the one God and Father of all, who is above all*, and whom Christ Himself styles his *Father and God*, John 20. v. 17. Heb. 1. v. 9.) to be the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*; whom he teaches and avows to be \* *three distinct, equally Supreme, necessarily existent, and independent divine acting Substances, or intelligent Agents, absolutely equal in Nature and all Essential Perfections*: and esteems *Self-Origination*, which he allows to be now peculiar to the *Father*, to be no *essential* or divine Perfection at all, but a meer *Mode* of Existence, fortuitous and precarious; even so precarious and mutable, that the *Son* might have been Self-originated and the † *Father*, and the *Father* might have been *begotten* and the *Son*, had it been so agreed between them; and that also, by the same Agreement, the *Holy Ghost* might have been either the *Father* or the *Son*, or both by turns, as now He is neither; and so the whole Œconomy and Order of the Christian Religion might have been inverted. If this is not supposing the Foundation both of natural and reveal'd Religion to be *mutable*, and possible to have been the Reverse of what it is, and that the Scripture Dispensation is a meer Babel, and Abuse of Sense and Language, I know not what can be call'd so.

Yet this is the Doctrine, so fundamentally opposite to Christianity, which Dr. W. presumes to call the *important and fundamental* Doctrine of the Holy Trinity; and this is the Doctrine, so justly and highly obnoxious to the Censures of the Church,

\* See his second Defense, p. 367, &c.

† Ibid. p. 177.

and the whole Body of Christians, which he has the Assurance (as if it was the Churches Doctrine) to call upon the Church to authorize, and establish by Humane Authority.

The Church, which he means, has had the *true Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity* laid before it, in the *Propositions* relating to this Doctrine which the late *Dr. Clarke* deduc'd from Scripture. These were well consider'd by the most eminent and learned Body of the Clergy; who after mature Deliberation, and without any Prejudice in Favour of *Dr. Clarke*, did not gainsay any Part of his Propositions; or alledge, either that he had misunderstood or misinterpreted any one of above a thousand Texts of Scripture, on which his Propositions were founded; or that any one of them was not rightly deduc'd from the Scriptures, which he brought to support them. What was this but a tacit Determination in Favour of the *Scripture-Doctrine* of the Trinity, asserted by *Dr. Clarke*. But as no learned and eminent Man has yet appear'd in Defense of *Dr. W's* Notion; so it is to be hop'd, that none will ever be so unwise as to risque the Reputation of his Learning and Religion, by appearing in so indefensible and bad a Cause. One eminent Prelate \* has already shewn his Sense of the *Dr's* fundamental Doctrine, by not so much as mentioning it in his Catalogue of the great and fundamental Doctrines of Christianity. So that as every Christian cannot but be surpriz'd at, so every Scholar must condemn, those high and arrogant Demands here made of their Faith to a Doctrine, which it is impossible that any knowing sincere Christian shou'd believe, or shou'd not utterly renounce and detest.

\* See the Bishop of London's 2d Past. Let. p. 24, 25. &c.

I proceed to examine his Conduct towards, and Treatment of those, who, in Defense of *Scripture* and primitive Christianity, differ from his Notion of the Doctrine of the Trinity.

He says, (*p.* 38.) “ Can those who believe Christ “ to be God, and who honour Him as such, ever “ think it reasonable or pious to hold Commu- “ nion with Men, who, by what they call *inferior* . “ *Worship*, do thus manifestly dishonour and de- “ grade their God and Saviour, denying his di- “ vine Perfections &c.” To the same Purpose he adds, (*p.* 42.) “ Guilt is contracted by commu- “ nicating with those, who openly and resolutely “ corrupt the Faith (knowingly or ignorantly) in “ very important Articles.”

But how do they dishonour Christ, who honour Him with every high Title ascrib'd to him in Scripture? who refuse him not the Title of *God*, tho' to be sure not in *Dr. W's* Sense of his being *the one God of Christians*, whom *St. Paul* styles *the one God and Father of all, who is above all*; this would be not to honour Christ, but to dishonour the Father who sent Him: but they acknowledge him to be God, as being the only-begotten Son of God, the *Word* or Revealer of his Will, whom God hath appointed to be their *Saviour*, *Mediator*, and *judge*. And how do they *degrade him by inferior Worship*, who, as the Church exhorts every Priest at his Ordination, *continually pray to God the Father, by the Mediation of Jesus Christ*? Do they *degrade* Christ in their Worship, who, according to his own Command, *pray to the Father in his Name* \*? Is giving to Christ *mediatorial Worship* *degrading* Him; or is it *degrading* Him by *inferior Worship*, in offering (as he Himself has commanded us, *Mat.* 6.9.) all our Prayers *primarily* and *ultimately* to God the Father,

\* *Jo.* 15. 16.—16. ch. 23.



to whom He Himself also *prays*? Is it *degrading* Christ by *inferior* Worship, to say that *Prayer*, in the most proper Sense, is to be understood of *Prayer* directed immediately to the Father;—that one Part of divine Worship call'd *Prayer* is most properly and emphatically *Prayer*, when directed to the first Person of the Godhead;—that *Prayer* properly, or emphatically, speaking, is praying to the Father, to whom all *Prayer* primarily belongs\*? If then all Worship of *Prayer* primarily belongs to the Father, is it *degrading* Christ by *inferior* Worship, to worship him (not primarily, but) in Subordination to the one God and Father of all, to whom he is *Mediator*, and through whom, therefore, all our *Prayers* and *Praises* ought primarily and ultimately to be offer'd to God the Father? This is our Rule of Worship; and if he is consistent, it will be his Rule too: Otherwise, let him say, not that we, but let him say, as he ought to say and in Consequence does say, that the Scripture *dishonours* Christ by giving *inferior* Worship to him; and that we, by following that instead of humane Inventions for our Guide, do likewise dishonour him by *inferior* Worship. I appeal now to any sober Christian for the *Charitableness*, *Equity*, and *Consistency* of Dr. W's preceding Insinuation.

The Texts of Scripture which he civilly applies to the Opposers of his Notion, as being such as openly reject the fundamental Doctrines of Christianity, and so not fit to be communicated with, are, viz. (Rom. 16.17.) † mark them which cause Divisions and Offences, contrary to the Doctrine which ye have learn'd, and avoid them. Again; ‡ (Gal. 1. 8.) tho we, or an Angel from Heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preach'd unto you, let him be accur's'd. Again; || (1 Tim. 6. v. 3,5.) If any Man

\* See his 2d Defense, p. 400.

† p. 105.

‡ p. 107.

|| p. 110.

teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome Words, even the Words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the Doctrine which is according to Godliness—from such withdraw thyself. Again; (Tit. 3. v. 10, 11.) \* *A Man that is an Heretic after the first and second Admonition reject; knowing that he that is such is subverted and sinneth, being condemn'd of Himself.* Again; (2 Epist. Jo. 10.) † *If there come any unto you, and bring not this Doctrine, (that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh, v. 7.) receive him not into your House, neither bid him God speed.* Thus we see how easy it is to abuse with Scripture-expressions. But is not making Scripture thus subservient, by gross and wilful Misapplication of it, to our Uncharitable Passions, really ridiculing and blaspheming it?

He proceeds to insinuate (p. 131—188.) that the Opposers of his Hypothesis of the Trinity are either not sincere Men, or that however *sincere* they are in defending what in their Conscience, and after the best Enquiry they think to be *Truth*, they are nevertheless *wicked* and *immoral*, and *impious* Men, and ought to be treated as such. He alledges to this Purpose, (p. 189.) “ it is not meerly our *Sincerity* that can support us, for of that we know nothing, in any just or proper Sense, but by the *Right* and *Reason* of the Cause; and we are not commanded to hold fast our *Sincere Errors*, (his reasoning requir'd him to say, *our Sincerity*) but to hold fast that which is *Good*.”

So then with *Dr. W.* *Sincerity* cannot be good, cannot be rely'd on, or so much as known, but by the *Right* and *Reason* of the Cause. This is very like laying Men under a Necessity of being *infallible*, or else to be damn'd for Heresy. But as I hope God will judge no Man by this Rule, so I shou'd be sorry that Men shou'd be so cruel to each

\* p. 114.

† p. 126.

other as to do so ; and if *Dr. W's Sincerity* is finally to be try'd by his own Rule, by the *Right* and *Reason* of his Cause, I think, I may without Uncharitableness say, that he is, and will be found, a very *insincere* and wicked Man. Our Saviour supposes, that *Sincerity* is the surest Way to come to the Knowledge of his reveal'd Truth ; and has promis'd (*John 7. 17.*) that if any one will do God's Will, i. e. is sincerely dispos'd to know and obey it, he shall know of his Doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether he spake of himself. Our Saviour therefore has taught, that *Sincerity* will secure Men from falling into dangerous and fatal Error. And as Men cannot but be conscious (if they will examine themselves) of their own *Sincerity*, as well as of their *Insincerity* (otherwise it is in vain that Religion is propos'd to them, which cannot be acceptable unless it is *sincere*) so their *Sincerity* will always be an Anchor of Hope and Confidence for them to depend upon God's Acceptance of their good Endeavours, to know and to do his Will ; tho' they may, thro' humane Infirmary, sometimes mistake it ; and have not (as not being infallible) always the *Right* and *Reason of the Cause*. It is therefore undoubtedly God's Will that Men shou'd hold fast their *Sincerity*, even tho' they are not free from Errors : and if Men, without Conviction, or for worldly Considerations, renounce those Errors which they *Sincerely* believe to be Truth, and so receive Truth into a dishonest and *insincere* Heart, I wou'd desire to know, whether they are more guilty in holding fast *sincere* Errors, or in holding fast *insincere* Truth. The Doctor seems to think, that if a Man does but profess what he calls *Orthodoxy*, howsoever blindly, implicitly, i. e. *insincerely*, he is a good Man : For as to his *Sincerity* he need not trouble himself about it, because he can know nothing of that but by the *Right* and *Reason of the Cause*. A



Man that runs down *Sincerity* at this rate, I cannot help thinking, gives just Suspicion of his own. And tho' the great Truths of Religion are very plain in themselves, and may easily be understood by the meanest Capacity; yet as they who have any Knowledge of Mankind cannot but be sensible, how even these great and important Truths are darkned by Superstition, and even lost amongst Antichristian Corruptions and Errors, one cannot help pitying and judging favourably of those, who seem to be fatally blinded by Errors receiv'd from Education, and impos'd by humane Authority. Those who are thus incurably *blind* our Lord hath allow'd us to think *to have no Sin* (*John 9.41.*) on that Account; but their Leaders and Teachers, who with the proud *Pharisees* pretend *to see*, as is there intimated, when they are really and wilfully blind, and not only so, but endeavour by the Force of Ecclesiastical Authority to impose their Blindness upon others, their *Sin* cannot but *remain*, as our Saviour says, and be aggravated with the highest Guilt.

He pretends (*p. 196.*) “ the Question is not  
 “ whether there shall be Creeds or no, (for all Par-  
 “ ties are for them under one Shape or other, and  
 “ always will be) but who shall have the drawing  
 “ of them, or who shall *impose* them——We pre-  
 “ tend not to impose Articles of Faith in an *arbitra-*  
 “ *ry* Manner, or to require any implicit Belief in  
 “ the Church: we require no Man to receive them  
 “ for *true* because they are ours, but because they  
 “ carry their Evidence along with them, and will  
 “ bear examining.” In flat Contradiction to which  
 Pretenses of his own he immediately adds; “ that  
 “ the Protestant Churches however do determine  
 “ beforehand, that every Person upon Examination  
 “ ought to find these Things true, which they have  
 “ form'd into *Creeds* and *Articles*, as to the main  
 Things

“ Things at least, and where is the Harm ?” The Harm is, that this is the very Pretense of the *Popish* Church, their determining before hand that Men *ought* to believe (whether they can or no) whatever they have form’d into *Creeds* or *Articles*; and that Church’s Imposition of them is founded on the very Presumption which *Dr. W.* here adds, *viz.* (p. 197.) “ the presuming that there are some “ Things so *certain*, that the Reason of Mankind “ *ought* to submit to them ; and that *those Things* “ *which they have defin’d are of that Kind.*” As if the Definitions of the Church, founded on their Interpretation of Scripture, were so *certain* and evidently true in themselves, that a Man, upon examining them, can no more sincerely doubt of the Truth of them, than of the Truth of *Mathematical* or *Arithmetical* Demonstrations, to which he compares them. Nothing, I think, can be pleaded stronger for popish Ecclesiastical Tyranny, and Imposition upon Men’s Consciences in Matters of Faith, in Support of which, the *Excommunications* and barbarous *Persecutions* of that Hierarchy are executed. If the Definitions of the Church are to be presum’d as *certain* as *Mathematical* or *Arithmetical* Demonstration, so that Men *ought* to find them *true*, and submit their Consciences to them ; I see not why the *Dr.* shou’d not speak out, and declare them *infallible* : For if they were *infallible*, they cou’d not be more *certain* than *Mathematical* or *Arithmetical* Demonstration, which is the highest Certainty. It is absurd, and more like Banter than Argument, to pretend that there is any Difference between this, which he calls the *Protestant* Way, and the *Popish* Way of *imposing Creeds* and *Articles*. The Papists say *their Church* is infallible, and therefore Men *ought* to receive the Definitions of it ; or to be punish’d with the highest Church Censures and Anathemas for not receiving them :

*Dr.*

Dr. W. declares, that the Protestant Way of *imposing*, supposes their *Creeds* and *Articles* to have *such a Degree of moral Evidence to attest them*, (p. 198.) *that the Reason of Mankind ought to receive them*; that Men ought to find them as *true and certain as Mathematical or Arithmetical Demonstration*; and ought to be punish'd with *Excommunications, Deprivations*, and every other Way that the Church hath Power to punish them, if they do not submit their Consciences to them.

Not considering the Consequence of what he had said, he presently adds; (p. 198.) "if indeed the Church Governours shou'd happen to administer *Poison* instead of *wholesome Food*," well what then? he is so favourable as to say, "there will then be Reason for Complaint; and if the Charge be made good against them, they ought to throw such Article out." But who shall make good this Charge? who dare, or ought to judge against Church Governours? He told us just before, that it is the Principle of the *Protestant* (as well as it is of the *Popish*) Churches, *that every Person upon Examination ought to find these Things true, which they have form'd into Creeds and Articles*; because (he says) *they are in the main as true and certain*, (tho they have not the same Kind of Evidence) as *Mathematical and Arithmetical Demonstration*: and *have such a Degree of moral Evidence to attest them, that the Reason of Mankind ought to receive them*. This plainly precludes all Liberty of private Judgment and Conscience; and it follows hence, that we *ought not* to judge against the Definitions of the Church, but *ought* to receive whatever is administred by it, whether *Poison* or *wholesom Food*; or we ought to be depriv'd of Christian Communion, and to endure all the Consequences of the Church's Anathemas.

These



These, he says, (p. 199.) are the Powers which Christ has left with his Church.

He had civilly said (p. 198.) “ our Way supposes Men ought to examine, in order to know that the Doctrine propos’d [by the Church] is true : and we judge with Reason, that if they examine with Care, and decide with Impartiality, they cannot think otherwise of it.”

So then he will allow you to examine, provided you examine only in order to know that the Doctrine propos’d is true ; but you are not to examine, in order to know whether it be true or not : for if you examine and do not find it true, then it follows that you have not examin’d with Care and Impartiality ; and you must either examine again till you do find it true, or be punish’d with Church Censures, Excommunication, &c. as an *unfincere* and *immoral* Man ; for that you ought not to judge for yourself against the Definitions of the Church, but ought to examine till you find them true or receive them.

Now this seems to me a more deceitful and barbarous Pretense, to ensnare Men’s Consciences, and then to ruin them for judging and acting according to them, than even the Church of Rome itself is guilty of. She more fairly and sincerely (however unjustly) tells her Members, that they have no Right to examine her Doctrines at all ; and therefore will not let them read the Scriptures, because as Dr. W. tells us, they ought to submit to all her Articles and Definitions, as being as true and certain as *Mathematical* or *Arithmetical* Demonstration. She does indeed (as the Dr. wou’d p. 198.) allow a few, who are capable (by their *Superstition*, *Bigotry*, or something worse) to examine in order to know that her Doctrine is undoubtedly true, that they may have something to say against Opposers ; and may pretend, at least, that their Do-

ctrine

ctrine will bear *Examination* : But as it is there at Mens utmost Peril, either with or without Examination, not to know the Church's Doctrine to be *infallibly true* ; so *Dr. W.* thinks it ought to be here at Mens utmost Peril likewise, if, after they are encouraged to *examine*, they do not know the Church's Doctrine to be *certainly true*, as certainly so as *Mathematical* or *Arithmetical* Demonstration.

And this *Dominion over the Faith* and Consciences of Christians, they have (he thinks) a Right to claim, in opposition to *St. Paul's* plain and express Declaration in Respect of himself and other Preachers of the Gospel, that they *had not Dominion over Mens Faith*. (2 Cor. 1. 24.) This Text, he says (p. 200.) is of *obscure Meaning* ; and pretends as if he knew not what to make of it. But had it been said that the *Church*, or Church Governours, *had Dominion over Mens Faith*, the Text with him would have been as clear as Light ; and any one that shou'd have scrupled his Sense of it, wou'd have been charg'd by him as guilty of heretical Pravity. The Sense of the Text is plain enough. The Apostle told them, (v. 13.) *that he wrote none other Things to them, than what they had read or acknowledg'd to be the Doctrine of Jesus Christ the Son of God, who was preach'd amongst them by him, and Silvanus, and Timotheus*, (v. 19.) this was the *Faith* in which, he tells them, (v. 24.) *they stood* ; and therefore in respect of their *Faith*, he says, he had no *Dominion* over them, either to alter or over-rule it ; in this they had no Lord or Master, but Christ the *Author* and Revealer of their *Faith*, and Ruler of their Conscience : and He, and the other Preachers of the Gospel, who were the Declarers of this Faith, were the *Helpers* and Promoters of their Joy and Consolation, in receiving and standing firm in the Faith and Doctrine of Christ. Therefore (v. 23.) he calls God

D

to

to witness, that his *not coming to them*, as was expected, was merely out of Tendernefs and *to spare them*, who stood in Need of Reproof on Account of some Divisions that were amongst them: *not that he had Dominion over their Faith*, or that, when he should come amongst them, he did expect that, upon his mere Authority, they ought to believe or receive any Thing as the Doctrine of Christ, or as an Article of their Faith, but what he had before, by the Inspiration and Power of the Holy Ghost, preach'd unto them, and which they were convinced, and had acknowledg'd, to be the Truth of Jesus Christ.

And if *St. Paul* renounc'd all Claim and Right by his mere Authority (tho an Apostle of Christ) to impose any Thing as Articles of Faith, or a Rule of Conscience, but what he had first prov'd, by the Power and Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, to be the Doctrine of the Scriptures, and the reveal'd Will of God by Christ; and had convinc'd those to whom he preach'd of the Truth of it; it cannot be Right, or become any Men, to claim such an Authority, who are not only uninspir'd and fallible, but often have, and always may have, worldly Views and Interests to serve by such a Power over the Faith and Consciences of Men. And the *Bereans* are commended (*Acts* 17. v. 11.) as being of *ingenuous*, free, and unprejudic'd Dispositions (which is the Import of the Word, render'd *noble*) in attending *with all Readiness* to the Word which *Paul* and *Silas* preach'd to them; and in believing it, after they had *search'd the Scriptures*, and found it confirm'd by them.

The *Church* then (any Authority of which in Matters of Faith and Conscience is never mention'd in the Scriptures, nor are we ever commanded there to receive the Doctrine of the Church) can only have an Authority to propose the Do-  
ctrine



ctrine of Christ, declar'd in the Scriptures as a Rule of Faith and Conscience to those who are convinc'd of the Truth of them; and to instruct its Members in the great and important Points of Religion, which are contain'd in them. And as all ought to have the ingenuous, free, and unprejudic'd Dispositions of the *Bereans*, in attending with all Readiness to the Word preach'd to them, *which is able to make them wise unto Salvation*; so they ought, with them, to have the Liberty of searching the Scriptures, in order to know and be convinc'd whether the Doctrine propos'd is true or not, before they receive or believe it; and to assent to it or dissent from it accordingly with Impunity, and without Force or Compulsion of their Consciences by any pretended Human Authority over them. One might have hop'd, that the Protestant Principle of the sole Authority of Scripture as the Rule of Christian Faith, in Opposition to any Claim of humane Dominion over it, had been sufficiently understood and universally receiv'd, so as not to be capable of Dispute, amongst Protestants.

Confounded, as it were, with the Force of Truth he says (*p. 200.*) “ the Protestant Churches claim no more than a “ *directive* or *instructive* Power “ over Mens Faith or Consciences.” So far good; but he adds, “ *Church Censure and Discipline* affect “ the overt Acts, the *Speaking, Writing, Teaching,* “ *perverse Things*; — for which (*p. 201.*) they “ are accountable to the Church, as much as other “ kind of Offenders are accountable to the State.” The Church, he says, claims no farther Power over Mens Faith than what is *instructive*; very well; to be sure it has no farther Right or Power. But that we may not think ourselves the better for any Concession of his, he takes Care to let us know, that he means nothing like what he says; for his meaning only is, that the Church claims not

to be a Searcher of Hearts, and not being so, it cannot know whether its Instructions and Doctrines are receiv'd and believ'd or not, and so long as Men keep their Thoughts private to themselves, they are out of the Reach of the *Church's Censure*. But if the Church knew Mens inward Thoughts, then he wou'd plead for a Right in her to censure and punish them, for not believing what it is impossible for them to believe; because, he says, Men ought not to *judge* against her Definitions, they *ought* to know her Doctrine to be true.

Was the *Dr.* sincere in saying the Church's Power is meerly *instructive*, he ought, in Consequence and Consistency with himself, to plead that the Church has no Right to go farther than merely to *instruct* her Members, by proposing to them what she judges to be the Christian Doctrine; and that instead of *instructing*, she *lords it over God's Heritage*, contrary to the Apostolic Ordinance (1 Pet. 5. 3.) when she requires any of her Members to make a declared Profession of her Doctrines, not expressly contain'd in the Scriptures; and demands the Submission of their Faith and Consciences to her fallible Definitions; and insists that they ought to receive them, and *examine them only, in order to know that they are true*; but not in any wise to doubt of them, or differ from them, under Pain of incurring her severest Censures upon every *overt Act* of *speaking, writing, teaching* otherwise, which cannot but be (according to *Dr. W.*) *speaking, writing, teaching, perverse Things*, howsoever true in themselves, or agreeable to Scripture, if they agree not with what she has *determin'd beforehand*, that every Person *ought to find true*. All Claim of this Kind of Authority to *impose*, and *censure* for not submitting to her Impositions, he ought to give up and plead against as inconsistent with the Office and  
Trust

Trust committed to her, which, he owns, *is no more than a directive or instructive Power over Mens Faith and Consciences.* But to allow that the Church's Power is *merely instructive*, and with the same Breath to affirm, that she has Power to *censure* and punish every overt *Act* of teaching, &c. tho Men teach nothing but that which they are persuaded may be concluded and prov'd by the Scripture (which is the Promise requir'd of, and made by, every Priest at his Ordination) this is such an inconsistent and arbitrary Power of *instructing*, as is fit only for a Popish Advocate of a Popish Church to claim.

The Reason which the *Dr.* gives for the Claim of this *Dominion over Mens Faith*, is as truly a Popish Reason as can be given. He says (*p.* 201.) "can any Man claim a Right of *perverting* (so he calls teaching out of the Scriptures) his Fellow-Christians, as he pleases, and at the same Time deny others a Right of doing what in them lies, to preserve their People from falling into the Snares laid for them? Shall they not be permitted to make Use of those *spiritual Powers*, which God has put into their Hands? Therefore [*N. B.*] let the Adversaries be content to keep their Thoughts to themselves, and then no Body can have Dominion over their Faith at all." No thanks to the Church then for that, according to the *Dr.* but to God only, who has not put it into the Church's Power to know Mens Hearts. But is not this *Popish Orthodoxy* in Perfection? The *Dr's* Complaint is, that if the Adversaries of his Notion claim a Right, as Christians and Teachers of God's Word, to declare what they believe and can prove to be the true Christian Doctrine; if they claim (as they are in Duty to the Church, as well as to Christ the Head of it, bound) to teach and instruct their Fellow-Christians in the Knowledge of God's reveal'd Truth;

and



and if, as they promis'd the Church at their Ordination, they are ready, with all faithful Diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange Doctrines contrary to God's Word; if they thus do their Duty to God and the Church, and are so happy as to convince many of their Christian Brethren by Reason and Argument out of the Scriptures; shall Dr. W. on the other Hand be deny'd a Right (instead of Reason and Argument out of the Scriptures, and in Opposition to these spiritual Weapons) to use his carnal Weapons; to do what in him lies, by calling out for Excommunications, Deprivations &c. not to convince but to punish all who do not agree to, or who dare to oppose, his Doctrine, how contrary soever it be to Scripture and Reason? Therefore I might justly return his Compliment, and ask him, "with what Modesty, Decency, or Consistency, does he claim a Right of perverting his Fellow-Christians, as he pleases," by such high and arrogant Pretences of Dominion over their Faith, as if he was more than an Apostle; endeavouring by the Force of Church Censures, which he thinks he ought to have at command, and to throw out at pleasure, to pervert and frighten his Fellow-Christians from embracing the Truth of Scripture; and at the same Time deny others a Right, which is the common undoubted Right of all Christians equally, to judge for themselves (since no others are qualify'd to judge farther) in Matters of Faith and Religion; and also by Christian Instruction, with Reason and Argument out of the Scriptures, to do what in them lies to preserve their Christian Brethren from falling into dangerous Errors, or being infected with Antichristian Doctrine? what Presumption is it in him to call upon the Church to espouse his Errors, which his Adversaries have more Reason to call upon it to censure and condemn, as being most opposite to those Scriptures, which

which the Church has declar'd to be the Rule of reveal'd Truth? He did not learn of the Church his Method of preventing what he may think to be Error: At his *Ordination* he promis'd the Church, *to instruct out of the Scriptures the People committed to his Charge*; and to form his own *Faith and Doctrine* by that Rule; and he was then exhorted by the Church, *continually to pray to God the Father, By the Mediation of our only Saviour Jesus Christ, for the Heavenly Assistance of the Holy Ghost.* This is a truly scriptural and primitive Exhortation and Form of Worship, of which the *Dr.* stands very much in Need of being reminded: and if he laid to Heart his Ordination-Promise and Duty, as a faithful Pastor, to instruct his Fellow-Christians in this Worship of God taught by the Church out of the Scriptures, and not to talk so foolishly, like a *Spanish Provincial*, of *Anathemas, Excommunications, Deprivations &c.* to propagate by mere human Authority, *Scholastic Absurdities and Contradictions* instead of *Scripture-Doctrine*, he wou'd appear both a more reasonable Man, and better Christian, than he now seems to be.

To give the Sum of this matter: if there is a Right at all of *private Judgment* in Matters of *Faith and Religion*, (and if there is not, Popery is the unavoidable Consequence) it follows necessarily, that there is a Right to declare this Judgment by *speaking, writing, &c.*; otherwise it is a *Right and no Right*, which is a Contradiction. If any one thinks that what another teaches, as his Sense of Religion or Scripture, is erroneous, he has Liberty to refuse Assent to it, and so it can do him no Harm; if he assents to it, thinking it *Truth* when indeed it is *Error*, it can still do him no more Harm than he does himself in mistaking the Sense of Scripture in any other Point; *i. e.* it can do him no real Harm at all: God requiring us, in  
Matters

Matters of Belief, not to be *infallible*, but only to be *Sincere* in our Enquiries after the Truth of what he has reveal'd to us. In fundamental Points sincere Men are in no Danger of erring, tho' *Churches* are; have err'd, and do grossly err, and, what is worse, *impose* their Errors for divine Truths. 'Tis exactly the same in *civil* Matters. If I have a Right to judge for myself, in Relation to my civil *Property* and *Liberty*, I have a Right to *speak* and *write* in Defense of this *Property* and *Liberty*; and also a Right, in Conjunction with others, to oppose the Invaders of them. Therefore, as the Subjects of a State have a Right, by *Overt Acts*, to maintain their Civil Liberty and Property against all arbitrary and tyrannical Power, by uniting to reform it, or, if that cannot be done, to *destroy* it; so the Members of the Church of Christ have a Right to maintain that private Judgment which they justly claim, independent of all Ecclesiastical Power, in Matters of *Faith* and *Religion*, by the *Overt Acts* of *preaching*, *writing*, and *teaching*, what they sincerely believe to be the Doctrine and Truth of God's reveal'd Will; and to unite in Order to *reform*, or, if ir-reformable, to abolish and destroy all Ecclesiastical Authority, usurping Dominion over their *Faith* and *Consciences*.

This Assertion of Christian Liberty is the Ground of the Protestant Reformation; as on the contrary, our Author's Notion is the Ground of Popish Superstition and Tyranny, and is immediately destructive of all true Religion.

Let a Man then do what lawfully he can, by *teaching* or *writing*, to propagate Truth, and preserve his Fellow-Christians from falling into unchristian Errors: but let no Man, or Body of Men, endeavour to force, by civil Penalties or Discouragements, or by any Thing which they may



may think to sanctify by the Name of *spiritual Power*, the Definitions of their fallible Judgment for a Rule of Faith. If they do, the Members of the Christian Church, who may in Judgment differ from them, have the same Right to inflict Censures upon them, and, when they have Power, to lay them under Civil Discouragements, *Deprivations*, or *Incapacities*, as any Church so call'd has, or can have, to inflict upon *them*.

The pretended Difference in the Case of one having *Truth* on their side, and the other being in *Error*, which this Author alledges (*p. 203.*) is all Fallacy, weak and absurd. For as both Sides with respect to themselves, are equally Judges of what is *Truth* and *Error*, both equally *right*, and equally *fallible*, the one can have no better Claim to impose their Definitions and Doctrines than the other: Nothing can be more evident. And nothing remains for this Author to say, but in plain Terms to tell us, what is covertly maintain'd all through his Book, that the Claims of *Popery* are a just Right over Mens *Faith* and *Conscience*, which Christ has given the Church; and that we ought to submit to them; that if the Church administers *Poison* instead of *wholesom Food* or *Doctrine*, we may be allow'd to *complain*, like those who by a tyrannical Power are forc'd to drink down a deadly Draught, but drink it we must and ought; because, he says (*p. 196, 197.*) *we ought not to judge against the Doctrine of the Church.*

His Allegations from Scripture, for the Claim of *Dominion over Mens Faith*, are all foreign to his Purpose. The *Heretics* whom the Apostles declar'd excommunicated from the Church of Christ, or order'd Christian Assemblies to reject from their Communion, were all such as deny'd or acted contrary to the express Doctrine of Christ in Points of the greatest Importance, and whom the Apostles

infallibly knew did so. They were such as either deny'd *Christ's coming in the Flesh, the Resurrection of the Dead and a future Judgment*; or such as allow'd of *Fornication, and of honouring Idols by eating Things offer'd to them*. And none were accounted Heretics with Respect to the Divinity of Christ, but the impure, prophane, and impious *Gnostics, the Followers of Simon Magus*; some of whom (the *Cerinthians*) deny'd Christ, the divine Word and Son of God, to be *passible*, or to have really suffer'd for the Sins of Mankind; ascribing his Sufferings to his *mere human Nature*, or to the Man *Jesus*, as this Author knows who do: others held *three unoriginated necessarily-existent Persons*\*, in point-blank Opposition to the *Unity of God, the one God and Father of all*. This was an *Heresy* and *Impiety* both against *natural and reveal'd Religion*; this was a flat *Denial of the only Lord God*: yet this is the darling Notion which this Author espouses for *Orthodoxy*, with so much *Wrath and Uncharitableness*, as if he was possess'd with some of that old Heretic's Spirit, and was *in the Gall of Bitterness, and Bond of Iniquity* (*Acts* 8. 23.) But the Notion, which this Author perpetually stiles by the invidious Name of *Arian*, i. e. the Doctrine of the Subordination of the Son of God to the *one God and Father of all*, and who is *his God, and Greater than He*, is so far from being condemn'd as *Heresy*, that it is the very Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, inculcated in more than a Thousand Places of Scripture.

Let then every Church (tho not infallible as the Apostles were) endeavour to follow their Example in rejecting those, only as Heretics, from her Favour or Communion, who either by Immorality of Life, or by wicked Error, contradict

\* Τρεῖς ἀνάρχοι & ἀγενήτως. *Const. Apost. lib. 6. c. 10.*  
edit. Cor.

the plain express Doctrine of the Gospel ; this is *St. Paul's Rule*, *Rom. 16. 17.* Let the Definitions of Christ and his Apostles (not those of fallible Men) be the Rule to try every Doctrine *whether it be* (not of the Church, but) *of God.* Whatever Christian opposes, by teaching or otherwise, this Rule of Faith, opposeth not *Man* but *God* ; and in so doing is an Apostate, and cannot be sincere ; on which Account *St. Paul* says an Heretic is *self-condemn'd*, *Tit. 3. 11.* and so ought to be rejected from the Communion of Christians. And none are in so much Danger of being Heretics in a Scripture-sense, and incurring the *Anathemas* there denounc'd against them, as they are, who blindly following the Dictates of fallible or worldly Men as their Rule of Faith, do, as *St. Paul* did in his unconverted State, *kick against the Pricks*, deny the Faith of Christ, and by exciting Church Censures against it persecute, as he did, the true Professors of it.

How many have made shipwreck of their Faith by relying on this Foundation, I need not say ; but as it is certain, that the whole Scheme of this Author's Orthodoxy has no better Ground, he wou'd do well (if he is not incurably blind and infatuated) to consider whether, in his own Account of Heresy, he is not highly guilty of it, and ought to be rejected out of that Christian Communion, as a Teacher of false Doctrine, and a Deluder of his weak Brethren, out of which he is so zealous for ejecting others.

The Point plainly is, which he wou'd seem to debate in his Way (*p. 210—215.*) if the Scripture is a Rule of Faith in all Matters of God's reveal'd Will, and, as such, sufficiently plain in itself in all important fundamental Articles, and stands not in Need of an Interpreter, the Sense of whose Words, in necessary Points of Faith and Religion,



Religion, cannot be clearer and easier to be understood than those of the Holy Ghost in the Scriptures themselves ; it hence undeniably follows, that the Christian Church cannot better consult the Honour of Christ, and of true Religion, and the Happiness and Peace of all its Members, than by proposing its *Creeds, Confessions, Articles of Faith, and Forms of Worship*, in the Words and Forms of Scripture. Hereby the Church can incur no Danger of Error on its own Part, and all the Members of it will be free in their Consciences, and cannot offend or deserve Censure, but by departing from the Faith deliver'd by Christ and his Apostles to the Saints, or Professors of Christianity.

Men may, indeed, and have, for worldly Ends, and to avoid Persecution from *Pagan Tyranny* and Superstition, perverted and deny'd this Faith, and have been justly rejected by the Church for so doing, as *Heretics and Apostates*. But still the Fathers of the Church, in the first and purest Ages of it, never ventur'd to enlarge their Creeds beyond the Bounds of Scripture ; or to express their Faith in Terms of *Philosophy* and human *Invention* ; being so wise, as well as pious, as to know, that they cou'd not better express the *Truth* of God, than in the Terms of his Word. And it may, I hope, be said agreeably to their Sentiments without Offense, that the Sense of the Articles of particular Churches, which are mere Interpretations of Scripture, hath been, and is, and, probably, always will be harder to understand, and be more liable to be disputed, than the Doctrines of Scripture form'd in Scripture-Terms, and relating to all important Points of the Christian Faith are, or are like to be.

A remarkable Instance of the Truth of what is said, is a Point which our Author seems to lay greater

greater Stress upon, than on the whole Scripture. The Council of *Nice* (on whose Definitions, Dr. *W.* pretends, what he calls Orthodoxy, and the Doctrine of the Trinity, is founded) express'd the Doctrine of the Scripture and the Church, concerning the Son's being the *only begotten of the Father, the Image of the invisible God, the Brightness of his Glory, and the express Image of his Person*, this Similitude they express'd and defin'd by the Word (*ὁμοούσιος*) *consubstantial*; which, literally taken, means more than a bare *Similitude* (tho they meant no more by it) and may be understood, either of the *Father and Son* being of *one specific Substance*, in the *Tritheistic* Sense; or else of *one individual Substance*, in the *Sabellian* Sense. Now this was denoting, what was sufficiently clear in the Words of Scripture, by a *philosophical* Term, whose Sense was very liable to be disputed; and, accordingly, soon became matter of great Controversy and Contention in the Church. 'Tis true, the Council immediately explain'd what is meant by the Word *Consubstantial*, viz. that the Son *was not Consubstantial by Division of the Father's Substance* (as the Word literally imply'd) *but that the Word denoted, \* that there was no Similitude betwixt the Son and those Creatures which were made by him; but that he was altogether like unto the Father only who begat him.* *Athanasius* † himself owns this was the Sense of the *Nicene* Council; and so does the Council of *Antioch*, ‖ under *Jovian*, in like Manner understand it. This Sense of the Word was harmless in itself; and had this Explication, which, upon *Eusebius* of

\* *Euseb. Casar. Epist. apud Theod. Hist. Eccles. lib. 1. c. 12. & Socrat. lib. 1. c. 8.*

† Ὅτι ἀληθὴς ὈΜΟΙΟΤΗΣ ἦν [ὁ υἱὸς] τῷ γενήσαντι. *De Synod. Arim. & Seleuc.*

‖ *An. 363.* τὸ ὄνομα τῷ ὁμοούσιῳ ἀσφαλῶς τετύχηκε παρὰ τοῖς πατράσιν [viz. *Nic.*] ἐρμηνείας, σημαίνουσιν ὅτι ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τῶ πατρὸς ὁ υἱὸς ἐγεννήθη, καὶ ὅτι ὁμοίος καὶ ὕψιστος τῷ πατρί. *apud Soc. lib. 3. c. 25. & Soz. lib. 6. c. 4.*

*Cæsarea's* Proposal, was agreed to by the *Nicene* Council, always gone along with it, great and fatal Disputes might have been prevented. But the unscriptural Word *Consubstantial* being put into a Confession of Faith, and seemingly authoriz'd by a great and eminent Synod (tho never intended by it to be profess'd as the common Faith of Christians) they who were Lovers of Strife and Contention, more than Lovers of Truth and Charity, immediately fell a quarrelling about a *Metaphysical* Term, and laid a greater stress upon it, than upon all the Articles of the Christian Faith: one Party understanding it in the *Sabellian* Sense of being *one individual Substance*, and so, that the *Father* and *Son* were the *same Being, Person, Agent, or God*: The other Party, on the direct contrary, understanding it to mean the *same specific Substance*, in the Sense of *Tritheism* or *Ditheism*, which made the *Father* and *Son* two distinct *consubstantial Beings, Persons, Agents, or Gods*: both equally destroying the true *Divinity* of Christ, the Son of God, the one by confounding his *Person* with the *Father*, the other by *dividing* the Substance of the *one God* into *two Persons*.

Yet both these Parties, opposite as they were both to Truth, and to one another, had that good Opinion of themselves, as to stile themselves *Orthodox*; and both agreed (tho Heretics to each other) to brand, with the Name of Heresy, those who held the true catholic and primitive Faith, which was the Mean between the Heresies of *Sabellianism* and *Tritheism* held by these Parties. These, for Distinction's sake, I may call *Eusebians*, who, agreeably to *Scripture*, the unanimous Sense of the antient Church, as express'd in all their \* *Creeeds* and

\* Vide *Symb. Baptism. apud Apost. Const. lib. 7. c. 41. Iren. lib. 1. c. 2. lib. 3. c. 4. Tertul. de veland. Virgin. Prescript. adv. Harot.*



and Writings, and of the *Nicene Council* itself, declared their Faith in the *one only true God*, who was the *Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ; that the Son was the most *perfect Likeness* of the Father, who begat or produc'd him by his *Will* and *Power*, before all Worlds; that he was truly God, by the Exercise of a true divine Power and Dominion in the Creation of the World, and in the Government of the Church communicated to him from God the Father, and executed in *Subordination* and *Obedience* to his *sovereign Command, Will* and *Appointment*, who alone is the *Original* of all Power and Dominion, and alone the supreme God *over all* and *above all*, and *greater* than the Son, as he himself hath declar'd, *John* 14. 28.

This primitive Scripture-doctrine distinguish'd the Persons of the Father and the Son, in Opposition to *Sabellianism*, or those who held the *Substance* of the Son to be the *Substance* of the Father; and also preserv'd the *Unity* of God, in the unoriginated Person of the *one God and Father of all*, in Opposition to *Tritheism*, or those who held the distinct Beings, Substances, or Persons, of the *Father* and *Son* to be *equal* in *Nature, Dominion* and *Power*: and this was the Doctrine which generally prevail'd, and had the Sanction of the most numerous and eminent † Councils of the Church, even in its corrupt State in the fourth Century.

But as the Leaven of Superstition and Popery encreas'd, and by Degrees prevail'd, the *Tritheistic*

*Heret. c. 13, 14. & adv. Prax. c. 2. Symb. Lucian. Martyr. & Euseb. Cas. apud Socrat. Hist. lib. 1. c. 8. & Theodoret. lib. 1. c. 12. Symb. etiam Nicen. & Cyr. Hierosol.*

† Vide *Dissert. Præv. ad Novat. edit. Jackson. p. 67—70. & Annot. ejusd. in Novat. p. 375—378. & p. 387—391. and the true Narrative in Answer to Berriman's Hist. Account of the Trinity, p. 92—110.*

Trinitarian Notion gain'd Ground, and establish'd itself by Persecution and temporal Power : the *Man of Sin* grew up with it, and handed it down, from Age to Age, with many Superstitions, idolatrous, pestilent, and immoral Heresies, with which, as with Locusts, the whole Church was overspread, and the very Vitals of true Religion eaten up. And thus an Innovation, small in Appearance, and without any bad Meaning or Design at the first, once made in the Christian Faith, spread like a Canker, till every Part of the Christian Faith was corrupted by it: And Men having once departed from the Form of sound and Scripture-words, there was no End of their Wanderings, when, instead of Scripture, they follow'd fallible human Judgment (directed too often by Passion and worldly Interest) as their Guide.

The foregoing Observations, made to shew that the Scripture is the best and clearest Guide in all Articles of the Christian Faith, and easier to be understood, in all important and fundamental Points of Belief, than the best human Forms and Interpretations are, were necessary, on Account that the same Delusions and Errors, which prevail'd in the former Ages of the Church, by misunderstanding human Forms, and building false Doctrines on the pretended, but mistaken or corrupted, Sense of the Church, have seiz'd and been propagated in our Times.

To mention once more the precedent Instance of the Word [*ὁμοούσιος*] *Consubstantial*, or being of one Substance. From the Sound of the Word, one might be apt to think that the Council of *Nice* intended to teach, that the Son was, in a strict Metaphysical Sense, the *same specific unoriginated Substance* with God the Father, as if the Substance of God was divided into two Persons or Substances, or the Son was an undivided, but really distinct Part of the Sub-

Substance of God the Father; this is the literal Sense of the Word, but far enough from the Sense of the Council of *Nice*, as hath been shewn. Yet a Person unskill'd in Ecclesiastical Antiquity, or who never read or understood the History of that Council, will easily and naturally conclude that to be the Sense of the Council, and so be misled into the gross Error of thinking God the Father and the Son to be *two unoriginated Persons, Beings, or Gods*, because of the same Kind of Substance in both: it being impossible, as to conceive the Substance of the one God the Father to be other than *unoriginated*, so to conceive the Substance of the Son, if the same in Kind with the Substance of the Father, to be other than *unoriginated* also; to suppose the *same Substance* in Kind originated and unoriginated being a most flagrant Contradiction; and not less so than to suppose the *same individual, or undivided*, Substance to be *originated* and *unoriginated*. Indeed, as I have observ'd, if a Man has Learning enough to read and understand the History of the *Nicene* Council, he will find they meant nothing more by the Word *Consubstantial*, than to express their Sense, that the Son was not like to the *Creatures* which God made by *Him*, but was in all Things *like unto the Father*: or as *Alexander Bishop of Alexandria*, who occasion'd the meeting of the *Nicene* Council, declar'd his Sense, \* *that the only-begotten Son was a middle Nature betwixt the unbegotten Father, and the Creatures which God made By Him*. The Council took Care to disclaim the literal Metaphysical Sense of the Word, which imply'd a *Division* of the Substance of God; on which Account it had, about sixty Years before the Council of *Nice*, after mature Debate been rejected

\* *Alex. Epist. apud Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. lib. 1. c. 4.*



and condemn'd by the Council of \* *Antioch*, as a Word of *ill meaning*, and destroying the *Unity* of God. And for the like reason, after many Struggles *pro* and *con* about it for above thirty Years after the *Nicene* Synod, it was finally rejected, and struck out of the Creed, by a Council of above five hundred Bishops of the Eastern and Western Church, met together at *Ariminum* and *Seleucia*. The Sentence of the Synod was †; “ as to the Term *Substance*, which in Simplicity “ was us'd by the [Nicene] Fathers, but being not “ understood by the People gave Offence to them; “ and because also it is not to be found in Scripture, “ it is decreed, that it shall be wholly laid aside, “ and no mention be made of it for the future.— “ But we affirm, that the Son is *like* unto the Father, as the divine Scriptures expressly teach.” This is the Account of *Athanasius*; and *Jerom* agrees to it, and adds, || “ that the Bishops there “ did not regard the *Word*, so long as the Sense “ of it was preserv'd.” This Sense the Council declar'd to be, “ that the Son was LIKE unto the “ Father:” which indeed, as I have shewn, was the Sense of the *Nicene* Council.

As there never was a greater or wiser Council of learned and pious Bishops, assembled in the Christian Church, than this last mention'd, so their Example cannot but be highly worthy of Imitation, for the Preservation of Christian Peace and

\* See the true Narrative against Dr. Berriman's Hist. of the Trinity, p. 39—44.

† Τὸ δὲ ὄνομα τῆς ὑστάτης ὅπως ἀπλῆστερον ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐλήθη, ἀγνοούμενον δὲ τοῖς λαοῖς σκάνδαλον ἔφερε, διότι μὴ αἱ γεγραφαὶ τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς πείχουσιν, ἤρετε πειραιεσθῆναι καὶ παντελῶς μιμενίαν μνήμῃ τῶ λοιπῷ γίνεσθαι.—ΟΜΟΙΟΝ δὲ λέγομεν, τὸ πατρὶ ὅτι ὡς λέγουσιν αἱ θεαὶ γεγραφαὶ καὶ διδασκασθῆναι. *Athanas. de Synod. Arim. & Seleuc.*

|| Non erat curæ Episcopis de vocabulo, cum sensus esset in auto, *Hieron. adv. Lucifer.*

Charity ; especially, since not only as bad, but a far worse Sense has been put upon the Word, and insisted upon by the modern Impugners of the primitive and Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity, than was done at that Time, when the whole Eastern and Western Church, in Conjunction, agreed to lay it aside, and to obliterate the Memory of it for ever.

The plain and express Doctrine of Scripture, and the unanimous declar'd Sense of the primitive *Antenice* Church, had yet such an Awe over most of the *Athanasian* Party, that, in the Innovations which they had made in the Christian Faith, they durst not deny, but that the Father alone, as being *unoriginated*, was the *one supreme God over all* ; they durst not venture to affirm, that the *Son* (and much less that the *Spirit*) was [ὁ θεὸς παντοκράτωρ, ὁ θεὸς τῶν ὅλων] *the one supreme God, the one God of the Universe and over all* ; or that he was *equal* to the *Father* in *Dominion* and *Authority*. *Athanasius* himself acknowledg'd, that, in the *Creation* of the World, the *Son* acted in Obedience to the *Will* and *Command* of *God the Father* ; and that he, the *Son*, being the *Sender* of the *Holy Ghost*, was \* *Greater* than *He*.

But our modern Metaphysical Trinitarians, as if they were wiser than *Christ* and his *Apostles*, and the whole primitive Church, have advanc'd upon the Steps of the first Innovators, and improv'd the unscriptural Term *Consubstantial*, so as to build upon it, by vain Philosophy, the monstrous *Tritheistic* Notion of *three independent Supreme necessarily-existent intelligent Agents*, absolutely *equal*, and *coordinate* in *Nature* and all *Perfections* ; and when their *Tritheism* stares them in the Face, and

\* He calls the *Son* πνεύματος μείζονα, because he sent him, &c. *Orat. 2. adv. Arian.*

frightens their *Sabellian* Brethren, who are ready on that Account to reject them, they, by Contradiction very usual with them, affirm them, in the same Breath, to be *one independent, Supreme, necessarily-existent, undivided, intelligent Agent*; and say, \* *they are the same in Kind*——and also the *same in Number*; i. e. the *same, and not the same*: and also scruple not to affirm, that the Son is † “THE Substance of the Father,” in Contradiction to the *Nicene Creed*, and themselves at other Times affirming, that the Son is (not the Substance but) *of, or from, the Substance of the Father*, and is a distinct ‡ *acting Substance* or Agent. And if any Thing can farther shew a Disregard to (not to say a Contempt of) the whole Scripture-Doctrine, it is, that the peculiar Prerogative of the *Father*, as being alone *unbegotten* and underiv'd, always held *sacred* and *incommunicable* by the *Antenicene* and *Nicene Church*, is given up by Dr. W. “who has nothing to say (2d Defense p. 177.) “why the *Son* might not have been *Father*, but “that in *Fact* he is not——and that there was “no *Impossibility* in the Nature of the Thing, “but that the *Father* Himself might have acted “the *Ministerial Part*.” An amazing Expression to come out of the Mouth of a Christian, who has the Benefit both of *natural* and *reveal'd* Religion, to inform his Reason and Understanding better! I will endeavour to make him ashamed of the gross Impiety of his Notion, from two eminent Bishops, one *Nicene*, and one *Postnicene* (against whom I am sure he has no Exception) *Alexander of Alexandria*, and *Hilary of Poitiers*.

\* Dr. Waterland's 2d Def. p. 394.

† Dr. Waterland's 1st Def. p. 379, 380.

‡ Dr. Waterland's 2d Def. p. 175, 366.



\* “ We must reserve to the unbegotten *Father* his peculiar Dignity (or Prerogative) as having no Cause of his Existence ; and pay a proper and suitable Honour to the *Son* also, as having a Beginningless Generation from the Father :— our Saviour Himself telling us, *my Father is Greater than I.*” Here the Father is expressly declar’d to be *Greater* than, or *Superior* to, the Son, as being unoriginated, and the Cause of the Existence of the Son.

*Hilary* in his Explanation of the famous *Syrman Council* (An. 351.) says ; † “ that the Son is *sub-*ject to the Father, by the *Nativity* or *Generation* of his Nature. That the Father is *Greater*, because he is Father, and the Son is *Inferior*, because he is Son—and that the Son is *sub-*ject to the Father, as the *Original* of his Existence,” which plainly shews his Opinion of the *natural Subjection* of the Son to the Father, in his highest or divine Capacity. Again, he has the following remarkable Words, ‡ “ It is most *impious* to profess the Son to be *unoriginate* ; for

\* Οὐκ ἔν τῷ μὲν ἀγεννήτῳ πατρὶ οἰκεῖον ἀξίωμα φυλακτέον, μηδὲνα τῶ εἶναι αὐτῷ τὸν ἀλλίον λέγοντας. Τῷ δὲ ὑπὸ τὴν ἀρεσκουσάν τιμῶν ἀπονεμήτεον, τὴν ἀναρχὸν αὐτῷ πατρὶ τοῦ πατρὸς γέννησιν ἀναπθέντας.—αὐτῶ φάσκοντ’ ὅτι πατὴρ, ὁ πατὴρ μὲν μείζων μὲν ἐστὶ. *Epist. Alex. apud Theodoret. lib. I. c. 4.*

† *Subiectum* alterum alteri *nativitate natura*. Patrem in eo *majorem* esse, quod Pater est, Filium in eo *Minorem* esse, quod Filius est.—Patri *subiectus* est (Filius) ut *Autori*. *De Synod.*

‡ Filium *innascibilem* confiteri *impiissimum* est : jam enim non erit *Deus unus*, quia Deum unum prædicari natura unius *innascibilis* Dei exigit—cum idcirco Deus *unus* sit, cum Pater Deus sit ; & Filius Dei Deus sit : quia *innascibilitas* sola penes *unum* sit—respuit erga *innascibilem* filium prædicari fides sancta, ut per *unum innascibilem Deum unum* prædicet. *Hil. ibid.* And our learn’d Bishop *Pearson* well observes to this Purpose, “ we must not so far endeavour to involve ourselves in the Darkeness of this Mystery, “ as

“ for if so, there will no longer be *one* God,  
 “ because the Doctrine of the *Unity of God* is  
 “ founded necessarily in the Nature of *one unori-*  
 “ *ginated God.*—There is therefore but *one* God,  
 “ seeing it is the *Father* who is (absolutely) God,  
 “ and the Son is *God of God*, because there is  
 “ but *one unoriginated Person*—The Holy Ca-  
 “ tholic Faith will not therefore allow the Son  
 “ to be taught to be *unoriginated*, that, by hold-  
 “ ing *one unoriginated Person*, it may thereby  
 “ teach *one God.*” Nothing can be plainer than  
 that Hilary thought it *impossible*, and that it was  
*most impious* to confess, that the Son was, or might  
 be, *unoriginated*, and the *Father*; this was to destroy  
 the *Unity of God*, which was necessarily ground-  
 ed in the *natural essential Self-Origination* of the  
 Father only; and this is the undoubted Catholic  
 Doctrine of all Antiquity. But in Opposition to  
 this Doctrine of the Ancient Church, profess’d  
 also by the most eminent *Nicene* and *Postnicene*  
 Writers, *Dr. W.*, by a fictitious œconomy of his  
 own peculiar Invention, has presum’d to affirm,  
 that it was *possible* in the Nature of Things, that  
 God the *Father* might have been the *Son*, and  
 the *Son* might have been the *Father*. Accord-  
 ing to this new and before unheard of Hypothe-

“ as to deny that *Glory* which is clearly due unto the Fa-  
 “ ther; whose *Pre-eminence* undeniably consisteth in this,  
 “ that He is *GOD*, not of any other, but of *Himself*; and  
 “ that there is no other Person who is God, but is God  
 “ Of *Him*. It is no *Diminution* to the Son, to say that he is  
 “ from another, for his very Name imports as much; but it  
 “ were a *Diminution* to the Father to speak so of Him: And  
 “ there must be some *Pre-eminence*, where there is Place for  
 “ *Derogation.*” *Expos. of the Creed.* p. 35. edit. 4th. Which  
 is directly contrary to *Dr. W.*’s Doctrine, that the Son might  
 have been the *Father*, and so not of *Him*; and the *Father*  
 Himself might have acted the *Ministerial* Part, and so not  
 have had the *Pre-eminence* of being God of *Himself*.

sis, there is not only no *Essential* or real Distinction, in *Nature* and *natural Powers*, between the Persons of the Father and the Son ; but the *one God and Father of all, who is above all*, and the *God of the Son Himself*, might have been the *Son*, acted the *ministerial Part*, and in all Things have been Obedient and Subject to the *Will* and *Commands* of the *Son*, as his *Father and God*. This is telling the World, that the primary fundamental Article both of natural and reveal'd Religion, the *Unity of God*, has no Foundation ; and instead of the one God of *Nature and Scripture*, is setting up a worse than Heathen System of *three* fictitious, and equally *Supreme*, Deities ; who by Agreement amongst themselves go by different *Names*, without any real Difference or Subordination of *Nature, Power* or *Authority*, all being, in themselves, and in their *Natures*, equally self-existent, independent, or underiv'd. He has pretended to alledge *Scripture, Reason*, and *Antiquity*, for this impious Hypothesis, and he has been confuted, over and over, from every one of them ; from above a thousand plain and express Texts of *Scripture* ; from the most self-evident and demonstrative Principles of *Reason* ; and from the unanimous Suffrage of all *Antiquity*. He never was able to produce so much as one single Text of *Scripture*, but what proves any thing else as much as his Notion ; nor so much as one single Testimony of *Antiquity*, for three Hundred Years and more, that gives the least Countenance to it ; nor cou'd he ever shew, that it was not contradictory (as evidently contradictory as *Transubstantiation* itself) to the most demonstrative Principles of *Reason* : So that, all Things consider'd, the whole of his Scheme cannot but appear a monstrous System of the worst Heresies mix'd and confounded



confounded together, destructive of all *Science* and *Religion*, and necessarily ending in *Atheism*.

He may well be afraid of *Scripture-Creeds*, *Tests*, and *Confessions*, i. e. Forms of Faith drawn up in the Words of Scripture; and is so far consistent, as not to plead in their Favour (p. 210—215.) these being as opposite to his Notion as Light is to Darkness. What he wants is a *complete Authority* (p. 196.) to send out *Anathemas* &c. against his Opponents, and by human Power to lay waste the Christian Faith, and drive all true Believers out of the Church. But as the *Wrath of Man worketh not the Righteousness of God*; so I hope there is so much Light, and Knowledge, and Love too, of true Religion amongst us, that Antichristian Tyranny will never be suffer'd to invade Christian Liberty and Truth, which happily prevail amongst the Members of this Church; and must and will finally prevail, in the utter Destruction of all superstitious and wicked Error.

Hearken to the Charity and Moderation of this Author's moral Orthodoxy: "*Theft and Murder*" (p. 219.) are Crimes of a different Magnitude, yet they are equally liable to capital Penalties. "As to *Heresies* of such a Kind, they may be greater Sins than either in God's Sight: but it is not SO Necessary for a State to take Cognizance of them, unless they break in upon civil Peace." This is sufficient to shew how civil he would be to Heretics, if he had but the *competent Authority* which he speaks of. He wou'd not punish them *capitally*, because, tho he may think them to be worse than *Thieves* and *Murderers*, it is not SO necessary for a State to punish them as they do *Thieves* and *Murderers*. But as there is no End or Bounds in the Tyranny of Superstition, shou'd it be thought *expedient*, and for the *Good* of the Church, tho not absolutely *necessary*, I am afraid

he wou'd encourage, if not help to the pious Work of cutting those off (with the civil Sword) who trouble him, in their bearing Testimony to the Doctrine of Scripture against his Notion. He plainly supposes and intimates it to be necessary for the State [imagining himself, one would think, to be in *Spain* or *Italy*] to take Cognizance of them, as Criminals of the worst Sort ; but, like a true *Inquisitor*, desires them not to hurt them, at least *not to shed Blood* ; because, it is not SO necessary in their Case, as in the Case of *Thieves* and *Murderers*. How far he wou'd have the State go with these *Confessors*, he does not say ; he is afraid of directly calling upon the secular Arm to punish them ; and softly says, " that a Christian Divine may desire, " that such Offenders may *rather live to repent* " than suffer *Death*, or any civil Penalties." (p. 218.) Yet, on the other Hand, he is as cautious of absolutely exempting them from the Cognizance of the Civil Power ; without some Degree of which, Church-censures would not be effectual enough to ruin them.

In his sixth Chapter he undertakes to shew the Judgment of the Primitive Churches, in relation to the Necessity of believing the Doctrine of the Trinity. To this Purpose he says (p. 223.) " The Doctrine " of the Trinity, *implicit* or *express*, always made " an Article of the antient Creeds." Who doubts it? But why *implicit* or *express*? Did not all the ancient Creeds *expressly* declare the Scripture-doctrine of the Trinity ; the Doctrine of God (in most of the Creeds, *the one God*) *the Father Almighty* [*ὁ παντοκράτωρ*, Supreme over all] of his only [or only-begotten] Son *Jesus Christ our Lord* ; and of the Holy Spirit, &c. This is the Doctrine of the Trinity which we hold ; not *imply'd*, but *expressly* set forth in the primitive baptismal Creeds. But what has this to do with *Dr. W's* Trinity? Nothing like

like that is express'd in any of them. Therefore the Word *implicit* is to make Room for Art, to bring in his Notion. He wou'd have it thought, that tho his Doctrine of the Trinity is not *express'd*, yet that it is *imply'd* in the ancient Creeds. We are contented with what is *express'd* in the Creeds, as being the Forms and Expressions of *Scripture*; however, we will be so fair as to allow of his Notion, if it be really *imply'd* in them. How does he prove it to be *imply'd* then? Why thus (p. 225.) "in the Creeds we profess to believe in God the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost: this (adds he) is declaring the sacred three to be the *one God*—it carries in it a Confession of the three divine Persons being the *one true God of Christians*" (p. 225.) Q. E. D. Notably prov'd of a School-Doctor. But let us hear how St. Paul understands the Words; he says, *one Spirit—one Lord—One God and Father of all, who is above all*. Here, not the *three* divine Persons, but *one* of the divine Persons, the *Father* only, is declar'd to be the *one true God* of Christians; as the same Apostle says in another Place: *to us* (Christians) *there is but one God, even the Father*. And farther, that Dr. W's Doctrine of the Trinity is *imply'd* in the ancient Creeds we not only cannot see, but we certainly know that it is not; because it was the unanimous Sense of the ancient Church, who form'd and us'd these Creeds, that the *one true God of Christians* was that Person, whom the Scripture stiles, in Contradistinction to his *Son* and *Spirit*, the *one God and Father of all*. Accordingly, in almost all the Creeds (agreeably to the *Nicene*) the first Article was, *I believe in one God, the Father Almighty*: the Father only being always profess'd to be *the one God*, in Distinction to his *Son* and *Spirit*, never so call'd either in any antient Creed, or by any antient Catholic Writer whatsoever. So that if the Words

*imply*



imply the three divine Persons to be the *one God* in the Creeds, they *imply* them to be the *one God*, the *Father Almighty*. The Creeds therefore *expressly* and *implicitly*, plainly and undeniably, teach no other than the Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity; viz. *one Spirit—one Lord—one God and Father of all, who is above all* (*Ephes. 4. 4, 5, 6.*) and the *one God of Christians*, is declar'd in these express Words of the same Apostle cited above, *to us* (Christians) *there is but one God, even the Father, of whom are all Things* (*1 Cor. 8. 6.*) and this is spoken in direct Contradistinction to Jesus Christ, whom the Apostle there stiles the *one Lord*, by (thro') *whom are all Things*. This is St. Paul's Trinity and Unity, and it is ours, whom the Dr. civilly calls *Heretics*: Let him make his own Doctrine out of it if he can, and we shall no longer disagree.

Having done with Proof by *Implication*, he mentions (p. 230.) an ancient Creed of Cyril of Jerusalem, which is *express* for the Divinity of God the Son; it stiles him “ *true God, begotten of the Father before all Worlds, by whom all Things were made.*” Whether this Creed of Cyril be older than the fourth Century, may be question'd; however there is good Reason to think, that the Words [*Θεὸν ἀληθινόν*] *true God*, were inserted out of the *Nicene Creed*; because they are not to be found in any Creed of the three first Centuries, tho in some of them Christ is stil'd God. Cyril was one of the most moderate of the *Atbanasians*; and he expresses his Faith, and the first Article of all the antient Creeds, very clearly and fully, that *the one God of Christians was God the Father only*, in Contradistinction to the Son. His Words are, \* “ We ought not only to believe in

\* Οὐ γὰρ δεῖ μόνον εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν πρεῦν, ἀλλὰ καὶ \* πατέρα αὐτοῦ εἶναι τὸ μονογενῆς, καὶ εἰς δὲ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μετ' εὐσεβείας καταδεχόμεθα. *Cateches. 7.*

“ *the one God* ; but we also piously confess him to  
 “ be the *Father* of his only-begotten (Son) and  
 “ our Lord Jesus Christ.” And he immediately ob-  
 serves, that *Christians differ from Jews in this, that*  
*the Jews acknowledge there is but one God, but do*  
*not, with Christians, confess him to be the Father of*  
*our Lord Jesus Christ.* Yet Cyril held the Son to  
 be *true God*, and *consubstantial* with the Father ; but  
 did not infer from either, that he was *the one God*  
 of *Christians*, *the one supreme God*, or *equal* to the  
 Father. Being *consustantial* (he knew) imply’d no  
 such Thing, nor was so understood by the Council  
 of *Nice* ; and that the Son might be *true God*, and  
 yet there be, to us *Christians*, *but one God*, even *the*  
*Father of whom are all Things*, was plain to him for  
 this Reason, beause the Son was not *the one God*, but  
*the one Lord*, by *whom are all Things* : being *the*  
*one God*, of *whom are all Things*, denoted the Su-  
 premacy of the Father ; and being *the one Lord*,  
 by *whom are all Things*, denoted the Subordination  
 of the Son to him who alone was *the one God and*  
*Father of all, who is above all.* Thus his own Au-  
 thor, an *Athanasian* too, is clear and strong  
 against his Doctrine of the Trinity. And the  
 Learned *Dr. Spencer* well explains the Text (1 Cor.  
 8. 6.) to this purpose ; \* “ Under the New Testa-  
 “ ment, the Title of *King* and *Lord* is eminently  
 “ ascribed to Christ, that instead of the *Gods* and  
 “ *Lords* of the Gentiles, all might learn to wor-  
 “ ship *one God, the Father of all* ; and *one Lord,*  
 “ *Jesus Christ.*”

\* Sub novo testamento nomen Regis & Domini Christo  
 signanter tribuitur, ut omnes, Diis & Dominis Ethnicorum ad  
 crucem aut potius inferos amandatis, *unum Deum*, Patrem om-  
 nium, & *unum Dominum*, Jesum Christum, venerari discerent.  
*De Leg. Heb. lib. 1. c. 6. p. 253.*

The *Dr.* next observes, that *Irenæus* in explaining the Rule of Truth says, \* “ There is *one God Almighty*, who created all Things By his “ Word—adding, that he made all Things By his “ Word and Spirit.” This *one God Almighty*, *Irenæus*, in the Place, says, is the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*.

Now what is this to *Dr. W.*’s Purpose? He says, it “ *intimates* the real and proper Divinity of “ the Son and *Holy Ghost*.” But it does not *intimate*, but *express* the *Supreme Divinity* of the *one God, the Father Almighty*. And who deny the *real and proper Divinity* of the Son, but they who either make Him † *the Substance of the Father*, the *same individual God* with the Father; or another distinct, ‡ *necessarily-existent, acting Substance*, and *Supreme God*? The true and proper Divinity of the Son subordinate to the Father, as declar’d in Scripture, and by the Suffrage of the primitive Church, is what we have been pleading for, and vindicating these twenty Years against *Dr. W.* and the modern Impugners of it. We believe, and constantly teach, that Christ is God, as being the only-begotten Son of *the one God, the Father Almighty*, profess’d in all the antient Creeds: and can any Thing be plainer than that, to shew that Christ, the *Word* and Son of God, is not the *one God Almighty*, mention’d in *Irenæus*’s Rule of Faith; it is there said, that the *one God Almighty* created all Things by his *Word*, and by his *Spirit*? Are not the *Word* and *Spirit* the *Ministring and subordinate Agents*, the || *Hands* (or

\* *Iren. adv. Hæres. lib. 1. c. 22. p. 98. edit. Massuet.*

† *Dr. Waterland’s first Def. p. 379, 380.*

‡ See his 2d Def. p. 175, 366.

|| τῷ θεῷ χεῖρ [ὁ υἱός] — ὑπεργύσα τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός. *Iren. lib. 5. c. 5.* See a full Account of the Sense of the Antients in this Point, in *Annotat. ad Novat. p. 324, 325. Edit. Jackson.*



instrumental Agents) as he with others of the Ancients call them, *by whom the one God, the Father Almighty*, made and governs all Things? Here then is indeed the Doctrine of the Trinity fully express'd, but it is the Scripture-Trinity, and such as is directly opposite to *Dr. W's* Trinity. I pity his next Observation, as I suppose his Adherents will be ashamed of it: he was to shew, from the Antient Creeds, his Doctrine of the three divine Persons being *one God*; and having shewn nothing more, than that the Son is stiled or intimated to be God, but in express Distinction to *the one God, the Father Almighty*, and in Subordination to him; and not being able to shew, that the Holy Ghost is ever so much as barely stild *God*; therefore, left in the Account he shou'd be oblig'd to drop the Divinity of the *Spirit*, he observes very acutely (p. 231.) “ \* there is a Creed in *Tertullian* fully expressing the Divinity of God the Son, and “ [N. B.] *obliquely intimating* the Divinity of the “ Holy Ghost.” This is Demonstration indeed; the Creed *obliquely intimates* the Divinity of the Holy Ghost; what Need of any farther Proof? But this happens to be a most unlucky Observation for the *Dr.* because it undeniably shews, that *Tertullian* knew that the Holy Ghost was never stiled God in any ancient Creed. For his own Doctrine, that the *Spirit* was God, as being a *consubstantial Part* of the Substance of *the one God the Father*, was, he owns, a Doctrine, which he had just then learned † of the *Paraclete* of the *Montanists*; but he never pretends or intimates it to have

\* *Adv. Prax. c. 2.*

† Nos enim——maxime *Paracleti* non hominum discipuli duos quidem definimus, Patrem & Filium, & JAM tres cum Spiritu Sancto, secundum rationem Oeconomix [scil. unius substantiæ in tribus coherenibus, *adv. Prax. c. 12.*] quæ facit numerum, *adv. Prax. c. 13.*

been the Doctrine of the catholic Church : nay he owns that the Catholics charg'd his new Doctrine with \* *Tritheism*. Therefore *Tertullian*, tho', when a *Montanist*, he stil'd the Holy Spirit God, which no Ancient had done before him, yet he wou'd not so far innovate, as to assert it as a Part of the Christian Faith deliver'd in any Creed, but defended his Notion as a Part of his *Montanism* ; so that nothing in Nature cou'd ever be more opposite to the Dr's. Purpose and Doctrine, than his own Observation in this Place.

In Truth, all the ancient Creeds are as full and express against *Dr. W's*. Doctrine of the Trinity, as if they had been made on purpose in Opposition to it : and of all Things, I thought he might have been so prudent at least, as not to have appeal'd to the Creeds of the ancient Church, than which, next to Scripture, we desire no stronger Proof against his Notion.

Having try'd what he can do with genuine Creeds, he next presents his Reader (p. 234.) with one which is *spurious*, the famous romantic Creed which † *Gregory of Neocæsarea* is said to have receiv'd by Revelation from the *Virgin Mary*, who sent it him by *St. John*. Had there really been any such Creed in the Time of *Gregory of Neocæsarea*, *Eusebius of Cæsarea*, in whose Time *Gregory* flourish'd, most probably wou'd have known it, and made mention of it. *Jerome*, at least, wou'd have taken Notice of it, had he known it to have been *Gregory's*. The Stile of it shews it not to be older than the fourth Century ; and some Parts of it favour of being later than the Council of *Nice*,

† Simples quique, quæ major semper credentium pars, — duos & tres JAM jactitant a nobis prædicari, se vero unius Dei cultores præsumunt. *ibid.* c. 3.

† See *Greg. Nyss.* in laude *Greg. Thaum.* p. 378. *Nicephor. Hist. Eccles.* lib. 6. c. 17. *Ruffin. Eccles. Hist. Euseb.* lib. 7. c. 25:

tho' the [ὁμοούσιος] *Consubstantiality* is not mention'd in it. Even in this creed the Holy Ghost is not stil'd *God*; and the Son is represented as the Person (ἐν ᾧ) *by whom* (so the Words ought to be render'd) *is manifested God the Father, who is above all, and in all.* It contradicts the Council of *Nice* in one Point, by calling the Son [αἰδῖος αἰδῖς] *eternal of eternal*; the Council of *Nice*, on the contrary, anathematizing those, who affirm † *that the Son was not existent before he was begotten*; they believing him not to be an *eternal Son*, but the *eternal* [λόγος ἐνδιάθετος] *Word or Reason* existing in the Father, before he was *begotten of or from him.* However, let the *Dr.* make the best of this Creed likewise; neither the *Consubstantiality* or *Coequality* of the *Son* and *Spirit* with the *Father* are express'd, or imply'd, in it, (tho the contrary are) nor are the three divine Persons said, or intimated, to be *one God, the one God of Christians*; on the other Hand, the *Father* only is stil'd *God, who is above all, and in all.*

I shall, therefore, on the Head of Creeds, readily agree to what he says (p. 237) “ that the Creeds “ are to be interpreted according to the Mind “ of the Church; and the Mind of the Church is “ to be learned, chiefly, from the Writings of “ the Fathers.” We have already experienc'd his Proficiency, and Skill in explaining the Creeds; now let us see what he'll make of the Fathers. As just before he palm'd a forg'd Creed upon us, so now he brings a Parcel of false and insufficient Witnesses, for Evidence of the Sense of the ancient Church: And, instead of proving his Doctrine to be the Doctrine of the ancient *Antenicene* Church,

† Περὶ γεννηθῆναι ἐκ ἡν. *Anathem. Concil. Nic.* the Council's Opinion was, as *Eusebius* tells us: Περὶ ἐνεργείᾳ γεννηθῆναι, συνάμει ὡς ἐν τῇ πατρὶ ἀγενήτως. *Epist. Euseb. apud Theodoret. Hist. lib. 1. c. 12. & Socrat. lib. 1. c. 8.*



from the primitive Catholic Writers of that Church, he gives us Scraps from *Postnicene* Writers, engag'd to support Innovations made in the Faith of the ancient Church; such as *Albanasius*, *Gregory Nyssen*, *Hilary*, *Ruffinus*, *Fulgentius*, &c. This Procedure, therefore, is very unfair; and his Evidence for the Doctrine of the ancient *Antenice* Church deserves no more Credit, than that of *Arius* or *Eunomius* for the Doctrine of the *Nicene* Church. How incompetent his Witnesses are I shall give a Specimen in the famousst of them, *Albanasius*.

\* *Arius* taught that the Son subsisted by the Will of the Father, as the Doctrine of the ancient Church; *Albanasius* replies to the *Arians* very wisely, † let them tell us from whom of the primitive Saints they learn'd this Doctrine, that the Son subsisted by the Will of the Father. This shews how little *Albanasius* was acquainted with the Writings of the primitive Saints, or the Doctrine of the primitive Church; in which there is not any Doctrine more expressly and unanimously taught than this, that the Son was begotten and subsisted ‡ by the Will of the Father. The *Arians*, on the contrary, might very well have ask'd *Albanasius*, from what primitive Saint, or Writer, he had been taught his novel Doctrine of the Son's deriving his Subsistence, not from the Will, but from the || Nature of the Father; and he must have been silent, or ashamed. After all, the Sum of Dr. W's. Evidence, from his *Postnicene* Writers, amounts to no

\* ὁ υἱὸς [ὁ υἱὸς] θελήσει παρῶα. Thal. Arii apud Athan. de Synod. Arim. & Seleuc. vid. & Epist. Arii apud Theodoret.

† Ἐπαύσαν ἡμῖν—παρὰ πνθ—τὸ ἁγίων ἀκρίτως συμπεροήκασιν—τὸ—θελημαπ. De Decret. Synod. Nic.

‡ If any one has a Mind to see the concurrent Sense of Antiquity laid together in Respect of this Doctrine, he may consult the Notes which are added at the End of *Novatian*, publish'd by Mr. Jackson, p. 373—379.

|| Vid. adv. Arian. Orat. 4. p. 390. edit. Paris.

more than to prove (p. 238—240) the Son to be *God* (which is not deny'd) because the *Father* is *God*, which is no Proof at all: that the Name of *Father* implies a *Son*; yes it implies all Mankind to be his *Sons*, because he is the *Father* of *all*; and he farther pretends, that in their Opinion (tho they do not say so much) “ the Son must be “ allow'd to be of the same Nature with the Father, and EQUAL in all essential Perfections.” That these Writers shou'd hold the *Consubstantiality* is no wonder; and tho *Hilary*, with the other *Albanasians*, profess'd it, he was far from allowing the Son to be *equal to the Father in all essential Perfections*. What thinks he of *Hilary's* Saying, \* “ herein, more especially, the Son is not compar'd “ or equal'd to the Father, as being *subject* to him “ by a *Submission of Obedience*——as being SENT “ by him; as *receiving* every Thing from him, “ and, in all Things, *obeying* the *Will* of him that “ SENT him”——adding, “ that the Son is *Subject* to the Father by the *Nativity of his Nature*——again, is *subject* to the Father as the “ *Original* of his Existence.” Now was not *Hilary* a very proper *Postnicene* Writer for Dr. W. to alledge amongst others for his Notion, that *the Son is equal to the Father in all essential Perfections*? cou'd he have produc'd a Writer, even an *Antenicene* Writer, more strongly denying the *Equality* both of *Nature* and *Perfections*? *Fulgentius* and *Gregory Nyssen* speak more to this Purpose; but they are not only Writers of Lesser

\* In eo quidem maxime non comparatur nec coæquatur Filius Patri, dum subditus per obedientiæ obsequium est——dum mittitur, dum accipit, dum in omnibus voluntati ejus, qui se misit, obsequitur. *Hil. de Synod.*

Subiectum alterum alteri *nativitate naturæ*. Patrem in eo majorem esse quod *Pater* est, Filium in eo minorem esse quod *Filius* est —— Patri *subiectus* est ut auctori. *Ibid.*

Note, but the latter especially is a *Tritbeiß*, as the learn'd † *Dr. Cudworth* hath observ'd.

Besides, I would ask, with Respect to the two last, who seem to have thought that every Thing, or Perfection, belonging to the Father belong'd equally to the Son, I wou'd ask, whether these Writers thought the *Nature* or *Substance* of God the Father was *unoriginated*, or not; and so, whether the *essential Perfections* of the Father were not all, with his *Essence* or *Substance*, *unoriginated* likewise; if they are, whether they thought, or with what Reason they thought, the *Son* to be of the *same essential*, i. e. *unoriginated Nature* and *Perfections* with the Father. But if the *Nature* and *Perfections* of the *Son* were both *originated* from the *Father*, as they durst not deny that they were; it follows that they cou'd neither be the *same*, or absolutely *equal*. The Thing is, the *Postnicenes*, talking of the Generation of the Son of God after the manner of *Humane Generation*, to which it wou'd admit of no Similitude or Comparison, run themselves into the most gross Absurdities and Impieties. The *Antenices* avoided all Offence, by taking care not to define the metaphysical Nature or Substance of the Son of God, and by asserting his Subordination, and the *Supremacy* of God the Father. One Passage from one of these Writers wou'd have more Authority and Weight in shewing the Sense of the ancient Church, than all the *Postnicenes* he has cited. But the *Dr.* having burned his Fingers sufficiently by meddling with them heretofore, it was but prudent in him, to be cautious of referring to them any more. However he ventures upon two Passages (p. 241, 243.) one of *Dionysius of Alexandria* cited by *Abanasius*, and the other of *Novatian*. But what

† *Intellect. System*, p. 603, 604.



does *Dionysius* say in the Place refer'd to, in which he is apologizing for some Expressions which he was charg'd to have us'd, and so is to say the most he can for Himself? Does he say that he ever taught the *Son* to be *the one God, the Supreme God, or equal* to the *Father*? Nothing like it: all that he says is, “ that the *Son* is [*αἰώνιος*] *eternal*, or “ before the World—that he is *inseparable* from “ the *Father*—and that having been charg'd “ with making God the *Creator* of Christ— “ he says that having before stil'd him *Father*, he “ included the *Son* in Him.” In which Passage he does not deny that he made the *Son* a Creature at all, but intimates only that he cou'd not be suppos'd, to make him a Creature like the rest of the Creatures, because he thought him to be always *in the Father*. Now this is an evasive Apology; and his real Thoughts seem to have been, that the *Son* was always *in the Father*, as being the [*λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*] *internal Word or Reason* of God; but begotten *out of the Father*, as *Light from Light*, into a distinct real Person; and this *Generation* of the *Son*, by which he was a distinct subsisting Person, he had call'd a *Creation*, and in this respect made Christ a *Creature*, as he was accus'd of doing by the *Sabellians*. That this was his real Sentiment and Doctrine we learn from an unquestionable Witness, *Basil a Postnicene* and *Atbanasian*, but a fair Writer; he tells us, that having read the Writings of this *Dionysius*, he did not \* like several Things, that were in them; that he † thought him one, who laid the Seeds of the Anomæan Opinion; and that with respect to the *Consubstantiality*, he was ‡ *faltering and unconstant, sometime holding it, and other Times rejecting it*: more particularly, that he held

\* Bas. Epist. 41.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid.

“ \* the Father and Son to be not only *distinct*  
 “ Persons, but of *different Substance*; and that the  
 “ Son was *inferior* in Power and Glory to the Fa-  
 “ ther.—And besides this, he spoke very un-  
 “ becoming Words concerning the Spirit; not  
 “ allowing him *divine Worship*, but depressing  
 “ him into the Number of *created* and *ministring*  
 “ Beings.” And † *Athanasius*, in his Apology for  
 him, owns, that he did indeed use such Kind of  
 Expressions. And ‖ *Photius*, another unsuspected  
 Evidence, layeth the same Charge against him  
 that *Basil* had done. ‡ *Gennadius*, another *Atha-*  
*nasian*, does the same; and observes with *Basil*,  
 that the *Arians* deriv’d their Notions from him.

As to *Novatian*, his other Author, his Writings  
 are extant, on which Account Dr. *W.* should not  
 have presum’d to have alledg’d him for his Notion,  
 because the Reader, with his own Eyes, may see,  
 that the whole most excellent Book of that ancient  
 Writer is most full and express against his Doc-  
 trine of the Trinity, in Agreement with all the  
 Remains of primitive Antiquity. He gives, in his  
 last Chapter, the Sum of all his precedent Doctrine  
 concerning God the Father, and the Son; and in  
 this Chapter, the entire Doctrine of the primitive  
 Church is so fully and clearly contain’d, concern-  
 ing the *Supremacy* of the Father, as being alone  
*the one God* without compare or equal, and the  
*Subordination* and *Subjection* of the Son to him, as  
 deriv’d from him by his Will, and as having receiv’d  
 all his divine Power from him, and being constituted

|| Οὐκ ἐπερόληθα μόνον ὑποστάσεων τίθεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑστέας δια-  
 φοράν, καὶ δυνάμειος ὕφεσιν καὶ δόξης παρελλαγὴν—πρὸς δὲ  
 ταῖς, περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος ἀφῆκε φωνὰς ἥμισυ πρεπέας τοῦ πνεύ-  
 ματος, τὴν προσκυνημένην αὐτὸ θεότητα ἐξοείζων, καὶ κατὰ πε-  
 τὴν κτῆσιν καὶ λειτουργῶ φύσει συναριθμῶν, *ibid.*

† *De Sentent. Dionys. Sect. 4.*

‖ *Cod. 232.* ‡ *Lib. de Eccles. Dogmat. c. 4.*

by him the *Lord* and *Head* of every Creature, but himself, with every Creature thus put under him, still *subject* to his Father, who is thereby declar'd to be the *one* and *only true God*. \* This Doctrine of the primitive Church is so amply and excellently set forth by *Novatian*, as not only to deserve the most serious Attention and Consideration of every Christian, but to be alone sufficient to end all Disputes concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity.

\* Est ergo DEUS PATER omnium institutor & creator, SOLUS originem nesciens, invisibilis, immensus, immortalis, æternus, UNUS DEUS, cujus neq; magnitudini, neq; majestati, neq; virtuti, quicquam non dixerim præferri, sed nec comparari potest. Ex quo, QUANDO ipse VOLUIT, sermo Filius natus est.—Quin & Pater illum etiam *præcedit*, quod necesse est prior sit, qua Pater sit: quoniam antecedit necesse est eum qui habet originem, ille qui originem nescit. Simul ut hic *minor* sit, dum *in illo* esse se scit, habens originem quia nascitur.—Deus utiq; procedens *ex Deo* secundam Personam efficiens, sed non eripiens illud PATRI, quod UNUS est DEUS. Si enim natus non fuisset, innatus *comparatus* cum eo qui est innatus, *ÆQUATIONE* in utroq; ostensa duos faceret innatos, & ideo duos faceret Deos—*ÆQUALES* inventi duos Deos merito reddidissent.—si invisibilis fuisset, cum invisibili collatus PAR expressus duos invisibiles ostendisset, & ideo duos comprobasset & Deos. Si incomprehensibilis, si & cætera quæcunq; sunt Patris, merito, dicimus, duorum Deorum, quam isti consingunt, controversiam susciâset.—Unus est omnium rerum & principium & caput—Filius autem nihil ex arbitrio suo gerit, nec ex consilio suo facit, nec a se venit, sed imperiis paternis omnibus & præceptis obedit, ut quamvis probet illum nativitas Filium, tamen morigera obedientia adferat illum paternæ VOLUNTATIS, ex quo est, MINISTRUM: ita dum se Patri in omnibus obtemperantem reddit, quamvis sit & Deus, UNUM tamen DEUM PATREM de obedientia sua ostendit, ex quo & originem traxit.—Deus solus Pater est, qui extra originem est.—Unus Deus ostenditur *verus* & *æternus*, Pater—Deus quidem ostenditur Filius, cui divinitas tradita & porrecta conspiciatur; & tamen nihilominus UNUS DEUS Pater probatur—Filius autem cæterorum omnium Deus sit, quoniam omnibus illum Deus Pater præposuit quem genuit: ita mediator Dei & hominum Christus Jesus—concoris Patri SVO DEO inventus, UNUM & SOLUM & VERUM DEUM, PATREM SUUM—approbavit. *Novat. c. 31. edit. Jackson.*



To conclude this Head of the Doctrine of the ancient Church; as nothing is more certain and evident, than that the ancient Church never taught the Doctrine of three equal, supreme, divine Persons of the same essential Perfections, or that God the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost, are the *only true God*, or *the same God*; or that the Son and Spirit, are each distinctly, as well as the Father, *the one God*, the Maker and Creator of all Things; so on the contrary, the ancient Church always, and every where, taught, that there is but *one God* supreme over all, even over the *Son* and *Spirit*, viz. the *Father*; that the *Son* and *Spirit* were derived from the *Father*, as the original Cause of all, by his *Power*, *Will* and *free Pleasure*; that they are the inferior ministerial Agents, *By whom* he made the World; and that in the Creation of the World, and in all the Dispensations of Divine Providence, they *always* acted by his *Authority*, and in *Obedience* to his *Will*; and that thus the *Father* being their *Lord* and *God*, there is and can be but *One God*. Our own learned Bishop *Pearson*, and Bishop *Bull*, both own, that the ancient Church placed the *Unity* in the *unoriginated* Supremacy of God the Father. I take no Notice that the primitive Fathers never stil'd the Holy Ghost *God* or *Lord*, that being a Matter of no great Moment, the Holy Ghost being truly a *divine Person*: nor do I take Notice that they did not scruple saying, the *Son* and *Spirit* were *created*, and *Creatures*, tho all other inferior Creatures were created *By them*: \* this is most unquestionable of the most learned and eminent of the Ancients, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Tertullian*, the great *Origen* (whose Orthodoxy

\* Vid. *Dissert. prev. ad Novat.* p. 47—51. edit. *Jackson.*  
 πρωτόκτιστος *Clem. Alex. Strom.* p. 591. vid. *Phot. Cod.* 109.  
 τέλειον τέλεις δημιουργήματα. *Euseb. Dem. Evang.* lib. 4. c. 2.

never was suspected, or call'd in Question, even by his Enemies in his own Time, and whom Dr. *W.* allows to be undoubtedly Orthodox) *Dionysius of Alexandria*, *Theognostus* of the same Place, and *Gregory of Neocæsarea*, all *Origen's* Scholars, to which we may add, the most learned *Eusebius of Cæsarea*; and this they chiefly concluded from three Texts of Scripture, viz. *Prov.* 8. 22. 1 *John* 1. 3. *Coloss.* 1. 15. But they plac'd the œconomy of the Trinity where the Scriptures place it; not in philosophical Notions of *Nature*, *Essence*, and *Substance*, but in the *Subordination* of the *Son* and *Spirit* to the only true God the Father supreme over all, in *Power*, *Authority*, *Dominion*, and *Worship*. As the Father alone was supreme by unoriginated Power and Authority, so he was the supreme and ultimate Object of *Worship*; and all *Prayers* and *Praises*, offer'd thro' the *Son* and *Spirit*, finally terminated in his Person, who is *above all*, and *in all*, and *thro' all*. If this was duely and piously consider'd, there wou'd be no Controversy about the Doctrine of the Trinity; all Scholastic Metaphysical Notions, which ought never to enter into religious *Faith* or *Worship*, wou'd give Way to the plain Scripture-doctrine; and the Christian Church would be deliver'd from many gross and pestilent Errors.

Next Dr. *W.* (p. 246—355) gives his Reader a long Detail of old Heretics, condemn'd by the primitive Church, which, had I been in his Case, I wou'd not have said one Word about, because by plain Implication and Consequence, the Scholastic Trinitarian Notion is a Compound of all the first six Heresies, with the Addition of a seventh, worse than any of them. As to the seventh, mention'd by the Dr., he did not consider, that *Arius* flourish'd in the fourth Century, and so is not to be reckon'd amongst those, whose Opinions were censur'd by the ancient Church,

that

that being always meant of the pure uncorrupt *Antenice* Church, which never condemn'd his Doctrine.

The Notions of all the Heretics which he recites, viz. *Cerintbus*, *Ebion*, *Theodotus*, *Artemon*, *Beryllus*, *Paul of Samosata*, co-incided, and are known better by the Names of *Sabellianism* and *Socinianism*; but *Tritheism* (our Author's darling Notion) was too bad for any of these Heretics to hold. And that Dr. *W's* and the modern *Trinitarian* Doctrine is made up of *Socinianism*, *Sabellianism*, and *Tritheism*, is most evident. The modern Scholastic *Trinitarians* consist of two Sects; one of which holds that the *Father Son* and *Spirit* are the *same individual Nature, Essence and Substance*, the *same numerical Being or Agent, the same God*, distinguish'd only \* *modally or nominally*, by the Appellations of *Father, Son, and Spirit*. This Sect I take to be the most numerous Part of these *Trinitarians*: and this was the Heresy of *Beryllus*, and † *Paul of Samosata*, and *Sabellius*, who, as *Eusebius* tells us, was condemned for an *impious* Heretic, for daring to affirm Christ the Son of God to be || *God supreme over all*, which was the peculiar and essential Character of God *the Father*. They holding the Son to have no Divinity but *of the one supreme God*, i. e. the Father, deny'd virtually that he had any Divinity of his own [θεότητα ἰδίαν] any distinct

\* Addo ego personam sine essentia concipi non posse, nisi statueris personam in divinis nihil aliud esse quam merum πρόπον ὑπάρξεως, quod plane Sabellianum est. *Bull. Def. F. N. lib. 4. p. 439.*

† Patres, cum Paulus Samosatenus hæreticus pronunciatus est, etiam homousion repudiaverint: quia per hanc *unius essentia* nuncupationem, solitarium atq; unicum sibi esse Patrem & Filium prædicabat. *Hil. de synod.*

|| Ἀυτὸς ὡς ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός· ὃ δὴ τολμήσαντα φάναι τὸν Σαβέλλιον, ἡ ἐκκλησία οὕτως θεὸν ἐν Ἀθέοις καὶ βλασφήμοις ἐγκατέθεκεν, *Ecclef. Theol. lib. 2. c. 4.*



*personal Divinity*, as \* *Eusebius* relates of *Beryllus*. In like manner, these Scholastic Trinitarians, holding that the *Nature* and all the *essential Perfections* of the one God and Father of all are the individual *Nature* and *Perfections* of the Son, &c. and leaving no Distinction of Nature and Attributes between them, do manifestly, with the fore-mention'd Heretics, *Beryllus*, *Sabellius*, and *Paul of Samosata*, deny the Divinity, the personal Divinity of Christ the Son of God. And farther, this Notion, which confounds the Persons of the Father and Son, does also by necessary Consequence make Jesus Christ (with the *Socinians*) a mere Man, in whom God the Father dwells; and by whom he has manifested his Will to Mankind; and thus it coincides with the Heresy of *Ebion*, *Theodotus*, and *Artemon*, who held Jesus Christ to be a mere Man, as the *Socinians* do. So that the modern Notion of the Trinity, which the Popish Schoolmen introduc'd, and chiefly prevails now, is only refining and mixing artfully together, by absurd Metaphysics, the foremention'd Heresies of *Sabellianism* and *Socinianism*.

Another Sect of the modern *Trinitarians*, few in Number in Comparison of the former, maintains with Dr. *W.* that the three divine Persons, *Father*, *Son*, and *Spirit*, are three distinct, independent, necessarily-existent, equally supreme, intelligent Agents; that the Divinity of the Son &c. is a distinct *acting principle*, co-ordinate with the Divinity of God the Father; and has all *essential Perfections* with his Nature or Substance, absolutely equal to, and co-ordinate with those of the Father: and that we may not doubt of their holding *Tritheism*, in the highest and strictest Sense, they say (if Christian Ears can bear such Blasphemy)

that the Son being *Son*, and being *sent* and *appearing* and acting in *Obedience* to the *Will* and *Commands* of God the Father, is not founded in any *natural, essential* or *real* Subordination of the *Son* to the *Father* in *Authority* and *Power*; but in a *meer voluntary Agreement* between the Father and the Son (as being distinctly co-ordinate in Nature and Perfections) to assume amongst Mankind different Names and Characters; for Dr. *W.* has nothing to say, \* *why the Son might not have been Father, but that in Fact he is not*—and that there was no *Impossibility* in the Nature of the Thing, but that the Father himself might have acted the ministerial Part. So that according to Dr. *W.*'s Orthodoxy, the Father might have been SENT from Heaven to do the *Will* of the Son, been made *Flesh*, and died in Obedience to the Son his heavenly Father; the Son might have been his God; have given to the Father all Power in Heaven and Earth; and as a reward for becoming Man, made him the *Mediator* between God and Man; exalted him to his own right Hand, and committed the Power of final Judgment to him. All which the Primitive Church declar'd to be most † *absurd, impious, and impossible.*

I 2

This

\* Second Def. p. 177.

† 'Ου τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων καὶ πατέρα—πεφάνθαι πᾶς  
 ἰς ἃν καὶ μικρὸν νῦν ἔχων, πληρῆσει εἰπεῖν. *Justin.* Ἀσεβής.  
*Concil. Antioch. cont. P. Samosat.* Visus est semper ex auctori-  
 tate Patris. *Tertul.* ut merito nec descendat, nec ascendat,  
 [Pater] quoniam ipse omnia & continet & implet. *Novat.*  
 solus originem nesciens, invisibilis [whom no man hath seen  
 nor can see, 1 Tim. 6. 16.] immensus, immortalis. Idem. *Ab-*  
*surdissime*—missus diceretur [Pater] *Augustin.* propter  
 auctoritatem solus Pater non dicitur *missus.* Idem. See all the  
 Passages, and many more to the same Purpose, cited at length  
 in the Reply to Dr. Waterland's Defense, p. 9, 18, 59, 64, 78,  
 128, 132, 136, 137, 138, 141, 142, 145, 148, 149, 151, 157.  
 And Bishop Bull; qui Filium proprie dici posse αὐτοθεον, hoc  
 est

This Doctrine is no less *denying* \* *the Father and the Son* [denying all real Distinction and Subordination between them] than that which *St. John* calls *Antichrist* (1 Jo. 2. 22.) And this also is that very *Spirit of Antichrist*, which confesseth not that *Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh*. 1 Jo. 4. 3. 2 Jo. 7. For if the *Father*, as *Dr. W.* admits, might have been *incarnate* (had it been so agreed) as well as the *Son*; and if there is no *Possibility*, as all confess, for the *Father* to be *really incarnate*, but only (per assumptas species) by an *assumed Appearance*; it follows hence, that the *Incarnation* of the *Son*, who is (according to *Dr. W.*) equally as the *Father* the one *God* supreme over all, cannot be *real*, but in *Appearance* only, must be a mere *Manifestation* [whether in a *real* or *phantastical* Body only 'tis all one] and nothing more. Accordingly, in his *Explication* of *Phil. 2. 7.* he says, that *Christ emptied Himself* [ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν, when he was incarnate] in *Appearance*. And farther as his *Notion* stands (if there is any *Consistency* in it) he must believe the *Father* to be as *really incarnate* as the *Son*; because the *Son*, as He affirms, † being *the Substance of the Father*, and therefore the *Substance* of the *Father* being as much incarnate as the *Substance* of the *Son*, the *Person* also of the *Father*, which cannot be divided from his *Substance*, is as much incarnate as the *Person* of the *Son*. The *Holy Ghost* also must, according to this *Notion*, be incarnate, since he makes the *Substance* of the *Father* and *Son* the *Substance* likewise of the *Holy Ghost*: the three

est a seipso Deum, pertinaci studio contendunt: hæc sententia catholico consensui repugnat——piam ac studiosam juventutem seriò hortor, ut a spiritu sibi caveant, ex quo talia profecta fuerint. *Def. Sect. 4. c. 1. Sect. 7, 8.*

\* *First Defense*, p. 17.

† *Ibid.* p. 379, 380.



Persons, he says, \* *are all one Substance*. So that either Way, and in spite of all his Evasions and Self-contradictions, the Heresy of the Gnostic *Docetæ*, who deny'd the *Reality* of our Lord's *Incarnation* and *Sufferings*, and were condemn'd by *St. John* as *Antichrist*, and always deservedly esteem'd the most infamous of all the old Heretics, stares him full in the Face. In Defense of this wretched Hypothesis it is that he says (p. 66.) " I can see no probable Reason why the Church of God shou'd be, as it were, first put under the immediate Conduct of the *Father*, then under the *Son*, and last of all under the Holy Ghost—when the *Father* might as well have had the sole Honour of all ; but upon the Hypothesis which I have hinted." I wou'd be glad to know, who first put under the *Father* the immediate Conduct of the Church of God. We read (*Ephes. i. 17, 22.*) that the God of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, the *Father of Glory*—gave (*Christ*) to be the Head over all Things to the Church : and also gave the Holy Ghost to be a *ministring Spirit* to *Christ*, in the same Church. But it wou'd be monstrous to hear or read, that the Church was put under the *Father*, as if he was capable of being put into an Office, how high soever, who is *Supreme over all*. The Conduct of the Church therefore is solely the *Father's* by Original supreme Right, *uncommunicated* and *uncommunicable* to Him ; and the *Son* and *Spirit* are declar'd, in Scripture, to be subordinate and ministring Agents to Him in the Government of the Church ; and as the *Son* receives his Office in the Church, which is *mediatorial*, from the supreme underiv'd Authority of the *Father*, so, if *Dr. W.* will hear *St. Paul*, he must, at the End, deliver up this his (*mediatorial*) Kingdom to God, even the *Father*——and the

\* *First Defense*, p. 378.

Son also Himself be subject unto Him who put all Things under Him, that God (even the Father, as he had said just before) may be all in all, 1 Cor. 15. 24, 28. Does Dr. W. think it probable or possible for the Father (in order to have the sole Honour of all) to be sent and become incarnate, and to be Mediator between God and Man? What then does he mean by this strange Hypothesis, from which, one wou'd suppose, that either he had never read the Scriptures at all, or not regarded them at all. This is the Hypothesis of the Trinity, so altogether Antichristian, which He holds, and is so zealous to maintain by Church Censures against all, who differ from him. This is the Man so free in charging those with Heresy, who adhere to the Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity; whilst he himself maintains real Heresy shocking in the last Degree, and subversive of the great fundamental Principle both of natural and reveal'd Religion, the Unity of God. Let him clear Himself of this Charge if he can; he has been admonish'd over and over about it, and must not think to clear himself by high Pretences and big Words; calling his Adversaries Names, and threatening what he wou'd do, if he had a competent Authority. There is in this (I cannot but think) something so presumptuous and infamously assuming in a Man, who is, in his Circumstances, and who is so deservedly above all others, liable to every Censure that is due to the Teachers of false Doctrine, the Deluders of Christians, and the Promoters of Contention, Strife and Division, as is unparallel'd and even amazing. If he is so infatuated with the Love of Antichristian Error, as not to abide the Communion of faithful Christians, the Door is open, and he may, with his deluded Followers, leave that Church, which professeth the Scripture, and the Scripture only, to be the

the Rule of its Faith; and which has no Concern with his Hypothesis but to condemn it.

Having made this general Remark upon his History of Heresies, there is very little remains worth Notice.

He says (p. 247) “ the Sum of *Cerintbus*’s Heresy was, that Jesus and Christ were *two Persons*.” This was neither the Sum, nor the grossest Part, of his Heresy. The Sum of his Heresy really was, that having made *Jesus* and *Christ*, or the *Word*, two distinct Agents, or Persons, he separated them at the *Passion*, and affirm’d (as \* *Irenæus* assures us) *that Jesus (only) suffer’d, and rose from the dead, but that Christ remain’d impassible*. The Sum of his Heresy and the very Essence of it, therefore, consisted in the denying that *Christ really suffer’d*; in his making the Sufferings of Christ the Sufferings of a *meer man*, and denying the [*Myos*] *Word*, or *Christ*, to be *passible*. This is the Heresy which *Irenæus* every where chargeth him and his Followers with, and very largely confutes up and down in his Writings. There was very good Reason for Dr. *W*’s dropping this principal Part of *Cerintbus*’s Heresy, and instead of it, amusing his Reader about other Points, quite foreign to the Purpose: indeed he wou’d have been much wiser had he drop’d the whole, or said nothing at all of *Cerintbus*; because it is apparent, that *Cerintbus*’s Heresy is the very Image of his own in every Part of it.

*Cerintbus*, he observes, made *Jesus* (the humane Soul and Body) and *Christ* [the divine *Word*] *two Persons*: very right; in Consequence he did so: and does not Dr. *W*. do the same? Does he not suppose, the humane Soul and Body, or the Man *Jesus*, to be as distinct a Person from the *Word*,

\* *Jesum passum esse & resurrexisse; Christum autem impassibilem perseverasse. lib. 1. c. 26. edit. Massuet.*



the divine Person, as *Cerintbus* did? I defy him to shew any real Difference. *Cerintbus* held the two Persons *united* at the Baptism of Christ, Dr. *W.* holds them *united* about thirty Years before; and what signifies this Difference in a Point of meer Time? Two Agents, or Persons, originally and in Nature, distinct and continuing to exist, are two Agents, and two Persons, whether separate or united; whether united at one Time or at another. So that in *Cerintbus's* Scheme the divine and human Nature, Agent or Person, were as much one Agent or Person at the Baptism of Christ, as, in the Dr's Scheme, they were at the Birth of Christ; and are as much two Persons in his Hypothesis, as they were in that of *Cerintbus*.

Again, *Cerintbus* separated *Christ* from *Jesus*, the *divine* from the *human* Person, at the Crucifixion, that the human Person or Man *Jesus* only might *suffer*; the divine Person [*λόγος*] *Word*, or *Christ*, being, by him, thought *impassible*. In like manner, the Dr. supposes *Christ*, the divine *Word*, to be *impassible*, and the *meer Man Jesus* only to suffer: he supposes the divine Person to be present only to the *Sufferings* of the meer Man *Jesus*, but not really to partake of them, or to *suffer*, any more than *Cerintbus* did. *Cerintbus* could not see, but, that if the Union continued, *Christ* must suffer, whom he thought *impassible*; and therefore rather chose to separate the divine Person from the Human, than to make it *passible*: Dr. *W.* thinks (more absurdly in my Mind) that the Union might continue, and yet *Christ* not suffer: but both evidently agree in the main Point, which *Irenæus* condemn'd in *Cerintbus* as an Antichristian Heresy, namely, that the *Man Jesus* only suffer'd, and that *Christ*, the *Word*, remain'd *impassible*. And 'tis farther observable, that he makes no Difference in this Heresy, whether the Persons, *Jesus* and

and Christ were united or not. “ \* If (says he) “ they alledge that they are *united*, nevertheless “ they declare that the one only *suffer’d*, and the “ other remain’d *impassible*.”

Had *Cerintbus* allow’d Christ the Word to be *passible*, and to have *really suffer’d*, *Irenæus* wou’d not have charg’d him with Herefy; for he insists upon it as a fundamental Point, that Christ the *Word* and *Son of God* did † *really suffer*; and argues that had the mere *Man Jesus* only sustain’d the *Sufferings*, the *Value* of them wou’d have been greatly diminish’d, and he wou’d have fallen short of the *Sufferings* of his *Martyrs*, if he their *Lord* and *Master* *really suffer’d nothing*.

The *Dr.* perhaps will say that the *Man Jesus*, or the *Human Soul* and *Body* in *Christ*, were not an *human Person*, tho’ they constitute a *Person* in every other *Man* in the *World*: *Cerintbus* might with equal *Reason* have said the same, and been laugh’d at for it; as *Dr. W.* has been sufficiently expos’d for making this || *Pretense*. And shou’d he be so ridiculous as to say this again, there is

\* Et si unitos eos dixerint, iterum ostendunt eum quidem participasse passionem, hunc autem impassibilem perseverasse. *Lib. 3. c. 17. edit. Massuet.*

† Μαθετε εν ανόητοι, οπ Ιησους ο παθων υπε ημων, ο κατασκηνώσας εν ημιν, επος αυτος εστιν ο λογος του θεου. *Lib. 1. c. 1. Sect. 20. edit. Grab.* ο λογος του θεου σαφες εγενετο και επαθεν. *ibid. c. 4.* invisibilis visibilis factus, & incomprehensibilis factus comprehensibilis, & impassibilis passibilis, & verbum homo.—Si alter quidem passus est, alter autem impassibilis mansit—non unus sed duo monstrantur. *lib. 3. c. 18.* Here we see *Irenæus* charg’d *Cerintbus* with making *Jesus* and *Christ* *two Persons*, because he suppos’d *Jesus* the *Man* only to suffer, and *Christ* the *Word* to be *impassible*; which is exactly *Dr. W.’s* *Notion*. Si enim non vere passus est &c.—Patiens verbum Dei Patris &c. *vid. Annot. ad Novat. p. 357—359. edit. Jackson.*

|| See farther Remarks on *Dr. W.’s* farther Vindication, p. 36—40. by *Phil. Cant.*

still no Difference between him and *Cerintbus*, in the grand fundamental Point of the Sufferings of Christ the Son of God. The Scripture says, *the Lord of Glory was crucify'd* (1 Cor. 2. 8.) that he who was in the Form of God—*humbled Himself, and became obedient unto Death* (Philip. 3. 6, 8.) That the Captain of our Salvation was made perfect through Sufferings (Heb. 2. 10.) And as the Scripture never supposes Christ to be more than one Person, so it every where supposes this one Person Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, to have suffer'd for our Salvation. This was the Doctrine of *Irenæus* and \* other Antients against the Heresy of *Cerintbus*; and this Doctrine, with the Scripture and primitive Fathers, we profess against *Dr. W's* Notion.

From what hath been observ'd it appears, that there is not one Egg more like unto another, than the *Cerintbian Heresy* is to *Dr. W's Orthodoxy*; and therefore I reserv'd *Cerintbus* to set him in the *Dr's* view, that in him he might see his own Face as in a Glass.

Another Thing to be observ'd is, that as before (p. 233.) the *Dr.* in Defense of his Notion, gave us a *spurious Creed*; so here (p. 269.) he puts upon us a *spurious Text* (1 Job. 5. 7.) Tho' the Text in itself, if it was genuine, is nothing to his Purpose, yet he must pardon me, if upon the occasion I put him in mind, instead of what St.

\* Ὅπως εἶδωμεν ὅτι ὁ πατήρ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ταῖς πα-  
θεσιν ΑΛΗΘΩΣ γεγονέναι δι' ἡμᾶς βεβέλεται, καὶ μὴ λέγομεν  
ὅτι ἐκεῖνος τὸ θεὸς υἱὸς ὦν ἐκ ἀντελαμβάνετο τῶν γινομένων καὶ  
συμβαλλόντων αὐτοῦ. *Iust. Mart. Dial.* p. 104. τὰ ἔθνη μετα-  
νοεῖν — ἀκέσαντα τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων αὐτῶν — κρηυχθέντα  
δι' αὐτῶν παθόντα ΛΟΓΟΝ. *ibid.* p. 106. ὑπὸ πάθῳ ἡλθεν ὁ  
ἀπαθὴς τὸ θεὸς ΛΟΓΟΣ. *Hippol. cont. Noet.* p. 16. *edit. Fabric.*  
And in some Creeds, God the Father was peculiarly chara-  
cteriz'd as being impassible.\*



*John* does not say here, of what he really does say in another Place, *I testify to every one that heareth the Words of the Prophecy of this Book, if any one shall add to them, God will lay upon him the Plagues which are written in this Book. Rev. 22. v. 18* ; that he may be sensible of the Danger of wilfully adding to the Word of God. That Text, which our Reformers (tho' dubious about it) admitted, but printed in a different Character, to signify its being wanting in the Original, has since, after the fullest Examination of it, been shewn to be an Interpolation in the sacred Writ, with a Degree of Evidence as clear and strong as ever was, or perhaps can be produc'd in a negative Point. It does not appear in any one *Greek Manuscript* extant, that is genuine or known to be older than printing ; besides that it is not once cited by any Antient Greek or Latin Writer, or Commentator. So that a Scholar, or one who has the least Knowledge of Manuscripts and Criticism, might be asham'd to alledge it. Nor is this all in *Dr. W's* Case. I have good Reason to believe that he was convinc'd that *St. John* really wrote no such Text, when he first entered into the Controversy about the Doctrine of the Trinity ; and that on this Account he did not alledge it in his Writings. What new Light he has since or lately receiv'd, I will not pretend to know ; but hope that if he has receiv'd any, he will impart it unto us for our better Information : and I shou'd be sorry, if to serve a present Purpose, he has alledg'd it against the Conviction of his Conscience. This wou'd be making himself an immoral profligate Heretic indeed.

Nothing farther in this long Chapter of the *Dr's* remains to be observ'd but his saying (p. 319.) " that the Conduct of the Church with respect to the *Praxeans*, *Noetians* and *Sabellians*, is a

“ Demonstration of the Truth of his Notion,  
 “ These Men charg’d the Church as teaching  
 “ *three Gods*. Then wou’d have been the Time,  
 “ and must have been, for the Church to declare  
 “ (had they ever meant it) that the *Father is God*.”

I shou’d be glad to know how this Objection of *Tritheism* is to be answer’d upon his Notion. He is so cautious as not to tell us how he answers it, because he knows he cannot answer it; and had he ventur’d to tell us truly how the Antients answer’d the Objection, it must have appear’d that they answer’d it so, as to confute and condemn his Notion at the same Time. He must then be a perfect *Novice* in the Writings of the antient Church, that does not know, or who does deny, that they did answer the Objection of *Tritheism* by asserting the *Unity* in the Person of the Father. They did constantly and invariably declare their Faith, that the *Father only is God*, i. e. God absolutely [*αὐτόθεος*] by supreme underiv’d Power and Authority; which being in Him alone, he was therefore the *one, only, and true God*. They never answer’d the Objection by asserting the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost* to be *one God*, or the *same God*, or the *supreme God*; or by saying that the *Son and Spirit* were, distinctly, with the Father, each the *one supreme God*; or *three consubstantial* divine Persons, *equal in Nature and all essential Perfections*: they were so wise as to know, that the first of these Assertions was coming into the very Notion of their Adversaries, and was that Assertion for which *Sabellius* was condemn’d by the Church as an *Atheist* \* and *Blasphemer*.

\* He had presum’d to assert Christ the Son of God to be (*ὁ ἐν παντί θεός*) God supreme over all; this was the same as to assert, that he was the Father; the Church not teaching any other Person to be God supreme over all, but the Father only.

phemer; and that the latter was directly owning that Doctrine of *Tritheism*, with which the *Sabellians* had charg'd them. But they knew the Objection of *three Gods* cou'd not affect them, who taught that the *Father only*, as being *unoriginated*, was the *one supreme God*; that the *Son* tho' God cou'd not divide the *Unity*, because he was not *absolutely* and *of Himself* God; because he was begotten, deriv'd or produc'd, by the *Will* and *Power* of God the Father; therefore was *inferior* to him in *Nature* and *Perfections*; and always acted *ministerially* in Obedience to the [αυθεντικὴ ἐξουσία] the *Sovereign Authority* of the *one God and Father of all who is above all*. This was the Answer which the antient Church made to the Objection of *Tritheism*, and it is the true Answer \*. The Sense of the Antients I have thrown

And had they who taught the Son to be a distinct Person from the Father, at the same Time taught, that he was *God supreme over all*, they knew they must have taught *two Gods*, and have renounc'd Christianity thereby; being assur'd from *Reason*, as well as from *Scripture*, that *two Persons, supreme over all*, were undoubtedly *two Gods*. This Dr. W. never consider'd, and, as it seems, never will. See *Euseb. Eccles. Theolog. lib. 2. c. 4.*

\* Nos autem unum & solum verum Deum Doctorem sequentes—qui in novissimis temporibus Filium suum manifestavit. *Iren. lib. 4. c. 69. Solus unus Deus fabricator—hic Pater, hic Deus. lib. 2. c. 55. Ipso Domino Patrem tantum Deum & Dominum eum, qui solus est Deus & dominator omnium, tradente discipulis. lib. 3. c. 9. Quid erit unicum & singulare nisi cui nihil adæquabitur? quid principale, nisi quod super omnia, nisi quod ante omnia, & ex quo omnia? Hæc Deus solus habendo est, & solus habendo unus est. Tertul. adv. Hermog. c. 1. Si filius fuerit ei cujus monarchia sit, non statim dividi eam & Monarchiam esse desinere, si particeps ejus adsumatur & Filius: se proinde illius esse Principaliter, a quo communicatur in filium. adv. Prax. c. 3. Si enim natus non fuisset, innatus—*

equatione in utroq; ostensa, duos faceret innatos, & ideo duos faceret Deos. *Novat. c. 31. see the whole Chapter. λεπτέον γὰρ ἀντὶς ὅτι τότε μὲν ΑΥΤΟΘΕΟΣ ὁ θεός ἐστι, &c. Orig. Com. in Jo. p. 46. ἐπεὶ δὲ δύο θεοὺς ἀνάγκη εἶναι τὸν τὰς δύο ὑποστάσεις πᾶντα ἐκ δὲ γὰρ δύο ΙΣΟΤΙΜΟΥΣ αὐτὰς οὐ ζόμεθα, &c. Euseb. Eccles.*



thrown into a Note below, for the Use of the Learned Reader ; and shall conclude this Head with *Athanasius's* own Answer to the Objection, who was not altogether so deeply immers'd in *Tritheism* as *Dr. W.* is. “ \* The Father does all “ Things By his Word, In the Holy Spirit ; and “ thus the Unity of the holy Trinity is preserv'd : “ and thus there is one God preach'd in the Church, “ who is above all, and through all, and in all : Above “ all as being the Father, the Original and Fountain ; Through all By [Through] his Word ; “ in all in the Holy Ghost. This Doctrine, he “ adds, was deliver'd from the Beginning, and “ is the Faith of the Catholic Church, which was “ given by the Lord ; which the Apostles “ preach'd ; and the Fathers preserv'd : on this “ the Church is founded ; and he that falls away “ from this [Faith] can neither be, nor be esteem'd, “ a Christian.” And it must be confess'd, that *Athanasius* never contradicted this, by venturing to assert that the Son was absolutely *the one or only God*.

But now what says *Dr. W.*, for the Church, to the Objection of *Tritheism*? He has nothing at all to say to the Point, and therefore he says ; “ They distinguish'd themselves off from *Sabellianism*, “ but so as to avoid the other extreme afterwards call'd *Arianism*.” How poor, low, and unscholar-like, is this Defense of the ancient Church ? as if they had nothing to say for themselves, but like a modern scholastic Quibbler distinguish'd themselves off, as he wou'd do if he cou'd.

*Eccles. Theolog. lib. 2. c. 7.* Auctoritate innascibilitatis Deus unus est. *Hil. de Synod.* Veteres Deum Patrem, eo quod Principium, Causa, Auctor & Fons Filii sit, unum illum & solum Deum appellare non sunt veriti : sic enim ipsi patres Nicæni exordiuntur suum Symbolum ; credimus in unum Deum, Patrem omnipotentem, &c. *Def. F. N. a Bullo. § 4. c. 1.*

\* *Epist. 1. ad Serap.*

Why

Why does he not let his Reader know from their own Words, how they *distinguish'd* themselves off from *Sabellianism*? No! that was not to be done without discovering at the same Time, that the Orthodoxy of the antient Church was of quite another sort from his Orthodoxy; and that his Orthodoxy was esteem'd by them a greater Heresy than *Sabellianism*. It was enough for him therefore to say, that they avoided what was afterwards call'd *Arianism*; knowing his Admirers to be such, that any Thing will go down with them, and that a mere *Word* at any Time is as good for them as a real Argument. But if I shou'd not be too troublesome to him, I wou'd ask him what *Arianism* is: and will venture to say, that if he once fairly and truly sets it before his Reader, it will appear not to be what he has hitherto call'd by that Name; and that the Game which he has been playing many Years, has been to decry the Catholic Doctrine of the primitive Church, under the feign'd Name of *Arianism*, in order to give a better Colour to his own Doctrine, as if favour'd by it, tho' it is certain (as I have already shewn, and shall farther prove presently) that it is a Doctrine which they detested as the rankest *Heresy*, and as bad as *Atheism*.

His seventh Chapter (p. 355—467.) which is to shew the Use and Value of Ecclesiastical Antiquity, might have been of some Service to his Cause, had he shewn before, that the Fathers of the antient Church, in their Creeds or Writings, had ever countenanc'd it; but since he is not able to shew so much as an Appearance of any Evidence from them on his Side, the Use and Value of Ecclesiastical Antiquity only serves to expose and condemn the more a Doctrine, which is utterly opposite to the constant, unanimous, and universal Sense of the primitive Church. What is here said

hath been in good Measure already prov'd; but in order to a Conclusion, I will briefly set before the Reader the Sense of the antient Church, with respect to the Doctrine of the Trinity, in their Interpretation of some principal Texts of Scripture relating to it. And this will give me very little Trouble. And to shew how fair I intend to be, I will begin with the Consideration of those Texts which he thinks most to his Purpose.

John 1. 1, 2, 3. *In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; the same was in the Beginning with God: all Things were made by him, &c.*

In the Interpretation of these Words, tho easy enough in themselves, there are several Things observable.

1<sup>st</sup>. Here are indisputably two distinct divine Agents, two acting Beings, according to Dr. W's own Sense, who owns that a Person is an *intelligent Agent* \*. One of the *Persons*, stil'd the *Word*, is distinguish'd from the other stil'd *absolutely* (ὁ θεός) *God*; as having been with God in the Beginning, i. e. of the Creation of the World; and as being the Person † *by* (διὰ thro') *whom* all Things were made.

2<sup>dly</sup>. It is observable, that St. *John* does not here stile the Word *God*, or say that *he is God* (as neither doth he say so any where else) but says, that in the Beginning *he was God*; meaning (as all the Antients have observ'd) that before his Incarnation, and from the Beginning of the World, he was *God*, or the divine Person who appear'd to *Adam*, the *Patriarchs*, &c. as the *Messenger*, *Word*, *Angel* and *Representative* of the most high *God*; of Him whom

\* Second Defense, p. 175, 366, 367.

† Ἐστὶ μὲν ὕψ' ἔ τὸ αἰπὸν — δι' ἔ δὲ τὸ ἐργαλεῖον. — αἰπὸν μὲν αὐτῶ [κόσμος] τὸν θεὸν ὕψ' ἔ γέγονεν; — ὅργακον δὲ λόγος θεῶ, δι' ἔ κατεσκευάσθη. Phil. Jud. lib. de Cherub.



St. John here styles *emphatically* and *absolutely* (ὁ θεός) *God*; appearing and acting ministerially in the \* *Name*, and by the *Authority*, of the supreme God: because it was *impossible* in itself, and *impious* to suppose the *most high God*, the *God of the Universe*, whom no one hath seen or can see, 1 Tim. 6. 16. to appear Himself in Person. This Character the *Word* laid aside, when he was made *Flesh*, v. 14. but instead of it receiv'd a greater, more glorious, and divine Name, being then declar'd the *only begotten of the Father*, and our Lord and Saviour.

This was a more eminent Character than being merely the *Word* of God, who as being the *Angel* of God, and the Revealer of his Will, had been stil'd God. Other Angels had the Title of God given them; but unto which of the Angels said he at any Time, *Thou art my Son*, &c. Heb. 1. 5. And when Christ was invested with this Character of the *only-begotten*, then it was commanded, that *all the Angels of God shou'd worship him*, v. 6. And after his Resurrection from the Dead, when *all Power was given him both in Heaven and Earth*, he then was declar'd to be the *Son of God with Power*; was highly exalted, and had a Name given him which is above every Name, that every Tongue shou'd confess, that *Jesus Christ is Lord* (of Angels as well as Men) to the Glory of God the Father, Phil. 2. 9, 11. Having a Personal Dominion given him, and being constituted, as Son of God, the Head over all Things to the Church, he was then made

\* Cujus auctoritate & nomine ipse erat Deus——visus est semper ex auctoritate Patris. Tertull. In nomine Dei variè visum patriarchis, Tertull. Ἀναλαμβάνων τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κρείττονος ὧν ὅλων ἔτις παρεγένετο εἰς τὸν παρὰ δεισιν ἐν προσωπῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, Theoph. ad Autolyc. Τὸν μὲν θεὸν ὡς ὅλων ἀπεβέβη ἀγγέλων νομίσαι καλεῖσθαι. Synod. Antioch. ad. Paul. Samosat.

*Lord over all*, which imply'd his being *God* in a far higher Sense, than when he acted from the Beginning, merely ministerially as the Angel of God and *Word* of God. This shews the Reason why *St. John* chose to say of the *Word*, not that *he is*, but that *he was God*.

3. The Evangelist says, *all Things were made By (διὰ through) Him*; that is, he was the ministerial Agent, *By whom* God made the World; whence it is infer'd, that he was really subordinate, in *Power* and *Authority*, to him who is stil'd God (ὁ θεός) absolutely; and who by Original, Supreme, underiv'd Power, made all Things *By his Word*.

Where is the Heresy of this Exposition? Or who can find out from the Words of the Apostle, that the *Word* who was *with God*, and *By whom* all Things were made, is (as *Dr. W.* inviolably maintains, p. 470.) *the same God with the Father*; the *same God* with Him, *with whom* he was in the Beginning; the *same God* with Him who made all Things *By Him*? This is *Dr. W.*'s avow'd Sense; for which he gives no better Reason than the stale exploded Pretense, that if he is not *the same God with the Father*, he must be *another God*, and in Consequence there must be *two Gods* (p. 472.) as much as to say, that Christ must either be the *same God*, i. e. the same Agent or Person with the *Father*, or else, if God at all, he must be another distinct, equally supreme, unoriginated Agent, Person or God; which indeed and nothing else, as hath been fully shewn, is properly *two Gods*, and was always so understood by the antient Church.

*Dr. W.* himself does not really mean, that the Son is the *same God*, i. e. the same individual Being or Agent, with the Father; he makes Him as much a distinct *acting Substance* or Agent, as his Opposers do. If then he is not thus *the same God*

God with the Father in *Dr. W's* Sense, how will *Dr. W.* himself avoid that Consequence, which he charges on his Adversaries Notion, of making *two Gods*? If he says that the Union of the distinct acting Substance of the Son, or of his Person, to the distinct acting Substance, or Person, of the Father makes them *the same God*, his Adversaries [if they wou'd take the Liberty of quibbling and playing with *Words* without Sense, as he does] might say the same; for they suppose as close and intimate an *Union* between the Father and the Son, as *Dr. W.* does or can do. But they know that *two Gods*, howsoever united, are as much *two Gods* as if not united, they are and must be *two united Gods*. So that *Dr. W.* is plainly entangled in his own Objection, and not only makes the Father and Son *two Gods*, as much as his Opposers do; but much more does he make them *two Gods*, making them so in the strict and proper Sense of *Ditheism*, as making them *two equal, supreme, independent Agents*, i. e. *two supreme Gods*.

On the other Hand his Adversaries are clear of this Charge. For as the *Angels* (and even *Men*) whom the Scripture stiles *Gods*, are neither the *same God* with the one God the Father, nor are *other Gods* in Distinction to him, or with the one God the Father make *many Gods*; because they are the *Ministers* of the one God, and act by his *Authority*: so much more neither does Christ, by being stil'd *God*, who is the *Son of God*, and *Sent* by the *one God* the Father, and who always acts in Obedience to the *Will* of him his *Father and God*, make it be infer'd either that he is *the same God* with the Father, or that there are *two Gods*. It is the *Sovereign unoriginated Power and Dominion* of the *one God and Father of all*, who is *above all*, from whom *Men and Angels* and the *Son* Himself is deriv'd, and from whom they receive



that Power and Authority, on Account of which they are call'd *Gods*, that preserves the *Unity* of God and *Monarchy* of the Universe in his Person, who is alone *Supreme over all*.

Next he invidiously, and also inconsistently, charges his Adversaries with making the *Word*, or *Christ*, a *Creature of the great God*. (p. 472.) For if they make him a *Creature*, how contradictory is it to charge them at the same Time with making him *another God*? For how shou'd the *Word*, if a *Creature* stil'd *God*, be *another God*, or make with the Father *two Gods*, any more than *Angels*, who are *Creatures* stil'd *Gods*, make with the Father *many Gods*? He is not aware what a foul Imputation he casts upon the Scriptures by the inconsistent Charge, which thro' a blind and perverse Zeal he throws upon his Opposers; who say no more than the Scripture says, and build all their Faith upon it.

Again, How does he prove that his Opposers make *Christ* a *Creature*? Or what does he mean by their making him a *Creature*? Do they say, or does any Thing they say imply, that the *Son* or *Word* of God is one of those *Creatures* which God made *By Him*? This is too absurd a Charge for even *Dr. W.* himself to lay upon them. Are there then *other Creatures* besides those which were made *By the Word*? let him tell us who they are, and where they are mention'd. Therefore it is very *unfair* in *Dr. W.* to charge his Adversaries with making the *Son of God* a *Creature*, because they do not think him to be the *one God and Father of all*. It is also very *inconsistent*; because if there is no Medium between the one *Supreme Unoriginated God* and a *Creature*, then *Dr. W.* who does not say, nay, who in Words [how contradictory soever] denies the *Son of God* to be *unoriginated*, does himself also make him a *Creature*,

as well as his Opposers do: but if there is a *Medium* between the one supreme *unoriginated* God and a *Creature*, then the Opposers of *Dr. W.* beg his Leave to think and to say, that Christ the *Word* and *Son* of God, is such a \* *middle Person*: and why does not *Dr. W.* say (as he thinks his Adversaries say or ought to say) in plain Terms, either that the *Son of God* is *unoriginated*, *unbegotten*, and *underiv'd*, or that he is a *Creature*?

Having thus shewn the Interpretation of the Text before us, and withal how absurd *Dr. W.*'s Explication of it is, and also how weak, frivolous, and contradictory, his Inferences are against our Interpretation; I proceed to set before the Reader the full Sense of the antient Church, on this Text, that he may judge thereby whether *Dr. W.*'s Explication, or that which I have given, is most agreeable to the Sense of the antient Church. And in this matter I will chuse, out of Favour to *Dr. W.*, to begin with the Exposition of the most learned *Origen*, because *Dr. W.* assures us (p. 310.) that "*Origen's* Orthodoxy in the Article of Christ's Divinity has been abundantly vindicated, and clear'd from all reasonable Exception." I desire he'll remember that he has said this; for I intend to give him enough of *Origen*, whom, I assure him, I admire for his Orthodoxy, as much as he can do.

*Origen* then says upon the Text, "*The Word was with God, and again, the Word was God.*"

\* *Alexander*, the famous Bishop of *Alexandria* who condemned *Arius*, says expressly, that the only begotten Son of God is a *middle Nature* between the *unbegotten Father*, and those *Creatures* which he made *By the Word*. Ἀγνοῦντες οἱ ἀνὰ σπῆτα, ὡς μακρὸν ἂν εἴη μεταξὺ πατρὸς ἀγεννήτου καὶ υἱοῦ κτισθέντων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐξ ἑκ ὄντων λογικῶν τε καὶ ἀλόγων, ὡς μεσιτετοῦσα φησὶς μονογενὴς, δι' ἧς τὰ ὅλα ἐξ ἑκ ὄντων ἐπείνεσεν ὁ πατὴρ τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ. *Epist. apud Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. lib. I. c. 4.*

" *John*

“ *John* very carefully, and as not being ignorant  
 “ of the accurate Nature of the Greek Language,  
 “ sometimes useth the Articles, and sometimes  
 “ omits them: adding the Article in the Appel-  
 “ lation, (ὁ λόγος) *the Word*; but in the Appel-  
 “ lation (θεός) *God*, sometimes adding it, and  
 “ sometimes, for Distinction sake, omitting it. \*  
 “ He applies the Article when the Title *God* de-  
 “ notes Him, who is the *unoriginated Author* of  
 “ *Universe*; but he drops it when *the Word* is  
 “ call’d *God*. And as in these Places (of the E-  
 “ vangelist) there is a Distinction made between  
 “ him who is *absolutely God* (ὁ θεός) and Him who  
 “ is simply (θεός) *God*; so observe whether there is  
 “ not the like Difference between *the Word* (ὁ λόγος)  
 “ with the Article, and *the Word* (λόγος) with-  
 “ out the Article: for as he who is *the God over*  
 “ *all* is *God absolutely* [ὁ θεός] and not simply *God*  
 “ [θεός] so the Fountain of that Reason which is in  
 “ every rational Being, is *absolutely Reason* [ὁ λόγος]  
 “ the particular Reason of every rational Being  
 “ not being stil’d properly, and in like manner,  
 “ with the Fountain of Reason [ὁ λόγος] *absolutely*  
 “ *Reason*.——To those who apprehended it might

\* ——— πῶς μὲν γὰρ τὸ ἄρθεον, ὅτε ὁ θεὸς ὀνομασία καὶ  
 τὸ ἀγνώστου πάσεται ὅτι ὅλων αἰτίου· σιωπᾷ δὲ αὐτὸ ὅτε ὁ λόγος  
 θεὸς ὀνομαζέται. ὡς δὲ διαφέρει κατὰ τέτυκτες τὴν τόπων Ὁ  
 ΘΕΟΣ καὶ θεός, ἕτως μήποτε διαφέρει Ὁ ΛΟΓΟΣ καὶ λόγος.  
 ὅν τρέπον γὰρ ὁ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεός Ὁ ΘΕΟΣ, καὶ ἐκ ἀπλῶς θεός,  
 ἕτως ἡ πηγή τῆς ἐν ἐκάστῳ ὅτι λογικῶν λόγου Ὁ ΛΟΓΟΣ· τὸ ἐν  
 ἐκάστῳ λόγου ἐκ αὐτοῦ κρείως, ὁμοίως τῷ πρώτῳ, ὀνομασθέντος καὶ  
 λεχθέντος, Ὁ ΛΟΓΟΣ. The Force of Origen’s Reason-  
 ing cannot be so clearly understood without some Knowledge  
 of the Greek Language, in which the Articles are often very  
 emphatical. But his Sense is evident, that *God the Father* only  
 is *absolutely God over all*; and the *Word* barely stil’d *God*;  
 the Difference between them being, according to Origen, the  
 same, as between *the Word*, whom he supposes the *Fountain* of  
 that inferior Reason which is in rational Beings, and the in-  
 ferior Reason of those rational Beings, as he expressly after-  
 wards says. *Com. in Joh. p. 46, 47.*



“ be infer’d from the Title of God being ascrib’d  
 “ both to *the supreme God over all*, and to the  
 “ *Word*, that there were *two Gods*, he remarkably  
 “ says, \* that he who is *God self-existent is* (alone)  
 “ properly and absolutely *God*; wherefore our Sa-  
 “ viour says, in his Prayer to the Father, *that they*  
 “ *may know thee, the only true God*. But every Be-  
 “ ing, besides him who is *God self-existent*, receiving  
 “ his Divinity by Communication from him, is  
 “ not (ὁ θεός) *God absolutely*; but may more pro-  
 “ perly be stil’d (θεός) a *divine Person*.” He adds,  
 “ There was He who is *absolutely God*, and He  
 “ who is *simply God*; then *Gods* in a twofold  
 “ Sense [viz. *Angels*, who are *Gods by Participa-*  
 “ *tion of Divinity*, or those who are call’d *Gods*,  
 “ but *really are not*, i. e. the Heathen Deities] the  
 “ superior Order of which Deities [the *Angels*]  
 “ is *excell’d* by God the Word, who is Himself  
 “ *excell’d* by Him, who is *absolutely the God of the*  
 “ *Universe*.”

Eusebius, the Learned Bishop of *Cæsarea*, makes  
 the same Distinction between the Word who is  
 God simply and without the Article, and the Fa-  
 ther who is *God absolutely* with the Article. Mar-  
 cellus Bishop of *Ancyra* had asserted that Christ  
 was [ὁ θεός] *God absolutely*; Eusebius oppos’d him  
 with the Passage of *St. John* before us, observing,  
 “ † that according to the Pretence of *Marcellus*,  
 the

\* Λεκτέον γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὅτι τότε μὲν αὐτόθεος ὁ θεὸς ἐστὶ. διότι  
 καὶ ὁ Σωτὴρ φησιν ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εὐχῇ, ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε  
 τὸν ὄντως ἀληθινὸν θεόν· πάντες δὲ τὸ πᾶν τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦ ΑΥΤΟΘΕΟΥ, με-  
 τὰ τῆς ἐκείνου θεότητος θεοποιούμενον, ἔκ τῃς ΘΕΟΥ, ἀλλὰ θεοὶ  
 κατωτέρων αὐτὸν λέγονται. — ὡς γὰρ ὁ ΘΕΟΣ καὶ θεός, εἴτα θεοὶ  
 διχῶς (Scilicet θεοὶ μετέχοντες θεῶν, i. e. Angeli &c., ἢ λεγο-  
 μένοι μὲν, ὑδαμῶς δὲ ὄντες θεοί. i. e. Dii Ethnicorum, p. 48.)  
 ὡς τὸ κρείττονος τὰ γὰρ μακροῦς ὑπερέχει ὁ θεὸς λόγος, ΤΙΠΕΡΕΧΟ-  
 ΜΕΝΟΣ ὑπὸ τοῦ ὅλῳ ὄλῳ θεῶν. *Com. in Joh. p. 46, 47, 49.*

† Κατ’ αὐτὸν, τὸ ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, ἴσον εἶναι τῷ, ἐν  
 ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ ΘΕΟΣ· καὶ τὸ, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν ἴσον  
 εἶναι

“ the Saying in the Beginning was the Word (ὁ λό-  
 “ γος) wou’d be the same as to say, in the Begin-  
 “ ning was (ὁ θεός) he who is God absolutely ; and  
 “ the Saying, and the Word was with God, the  
 “ same as to say, he who is God absolutely was  
 “ with Him who is God absolutely [or, according  
 “ to Dr. W., the same God was with the same  
 “ God ] and the Saying, the Word was God, the  
 “ same as to say, that he who is (ὁ θεός) God ab-  
 “ solutely, is (θεός) simply God, i. e. God not ab-  
 “ solutely. All which he concludes, is inconsistent  
 “ and absurd.” The Reason he adds is, that the  
 Word, being not unoriginated as the Father is, can-  
 not be absolutely God ; therefore the Evangelist \*  
 did not stile him God absolutely with the Article,  
 lest it should be infer’d that he was supreme God.

Methodius says ; “ † that the Word, By whom  
 “ all Things were made, is the Original of other  
 “ Things, next after the Father, who is his unori-  
 “ ginated Original.”

Having seen how the most learned of the An-  
 tients understood and distinguish’d upon the  
 first Verse of St. John’s Gospel, never in the least  
 imagining the Word or Son to be the same God  
 with the Father, or the supreme God, whom they con-  
 stantly declar’d to be the Father only ; I shall next  
 shew, that in their Explanation of the third Verse,  
 all things were made by him, they unanimously un-  
 derstood the Word, or Christ, to be the ministerial  
 Agent, who, in the Creation of the World, acted

εἶναι πρὸς, καὶ ὁ ΘΕΟΣ ἦν πρὸς ΤΟΝ ΘΕΟΝ· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὸ  
 τεῖτον ταῦτον εἶναι πρὸς καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ ΘΕΟΣ. αὐτὸς δὲ πρὸς τὸ  
 ἀσυναρπύτῳ καὶ παραλογώτατα εἶη αὐτῷ.—

\* Οὐκ εἰπὼν καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν ὁ ΘΕΟΣ μετὰ τῷ ᾧ ἀρθεῖ  
 προσθήκης, ἵνα μὴ αὐτὸν εἶναι ΤΟΝ ΕΠΙ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ (ΘΕΟΝ)  
 οἰκίσται. Eccles. Theolog. lib. 2. c. 14.

† Οὐκ ἔν ἀρχῇ, ΜΕΤΑ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀναρχὸν ἀρχὴν τῷ πατέρει  
 αὐτὸς οὐκ ἄλλων γίνεταί, δι’ ἧς ἅπαντα δημιουργεῖται. De  
 creatis.

in Subordination and Obedience to the *sovereign Will and Command* of the Father, as *the supreme God of the Universe*.

I shall, again, begin with *Origen* \*. “ The Expression, *By him*, (says he) never imports the *first* (principal) Place, but always the *second* Place——thus therefore, if here all Things are made *By the Word*, they are not (originally) OF the Word ; but are (originally) OF him, who is *superior* to, and *greater* than, the *Word*: and what other can this Person be but the Father ? ”

*Origen*’s Master, *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, had said before him, “ † There is one unbegotten Being, *God supreme over all* ; and one first-begotten Being, *By whom* all Things were made——for as *Peter* writes, there is indeed but one God, who made (or constituted) the Beginning of all Things, meaning his First-born Son,” who is the Beginning of the Creation of God, *Rev.* 3. 14.

*Irenaeus*, contemporary with *Clemens*, upon the Words says ; || “ By him (of or from him, as the

M

efficient

\* Ὁὐδέποτε τὴν πρώτην χώραν ἔχει τὸ, Δι’ ἧς, δευτέρα δὲ αἰὲς.—ἔγω τοίνυν καὶ ἐνθάδε εἰ πάντα διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο, καὶ τὸ τοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ ΚΡΕΙΤΤΟΝΟΣ καὶ ΜΕΙΖΟΝΟΣ ὡς τὸν λόγον· τίς δ’ ἂν ἄλλῃ ἔτ’ τυγχάνῃ ἢ ὁ πατήρ. *Com. in Jo.* p. 55, 56.

† ΕΝ μὲν τὸ ἀγέννητον, ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεός, ΕΝ δὲ καὶ τὸ περγνηθέν, Δι’ ἧς τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο.—εἷς γὰρ τὸ ὄντι ἔστιν ὁ θεός, ὃς ἀρχὴν τῶν ἀπάντων ἐποίησεν, μνηύων τὸ πρωτόγονον ὕδν, ἡ Πέτρας γενέσθαι, *Strom.* 6. p. 644. *edit. Paris.* In this Passage I have render’d the Word ἐποίησεν, *made or constituted*, it not appearing, I think, certainly from the Passage, and *Clemens*’s Observation upon it, in which of the Senses *Clemens* understood it ; tho it is certain that πρωτόγονον here is with him the same as πρωτόκτιστον, *first created* elsewhere : and ’tis well known, that he believed the Son to be a Creature. And yet his Orthodoxy is no more to be doubted of than his Scholar *Origen*’s, for whose Orthodoxy *Dr. W.* is a Voucher.

|| AB eo qui super omnes est Deus & constituta sunt & facta PER verbum ejus, Johannes quidem sic significavit——omnia

per



“ efficient Cause) who is *God over all*, they were  
 “ both appointed and made (per) By, or Thro’,  
 “ his Word” [as the ministring Cause] For he  
 there observes; “ *David* added, he commanded  
 “ and they were created: whom then did he com-  
 “ mand? namely, *the Word*, By [per, Thro’]  
 “ *whom* the Heavens were made.”

And according to *Irenæus*, \* “ He who com-  
 “ mands is greater and superiour to him who is com-  
 “ manded; because the one bears Rule, and the  
 “ other is Subject.”

Again, *Clemens of Alexandria* having asserted,  
 the Father to be the first or supreme Cause in the  
 Creation, adds, † “ that the Son is the *second*  
 “ Cause, By *whom* all Things were made accord-  
 “ ing to the *Will* of the Father.”

*Theophilus*, Bishop of *Antioch*, says, ‡ “ God  
 “ had the Word to be the *Minister* of those Things  
 “ which were made by him (as the efficient Cause)  
 “ and made all things *By him*.”

And *Tertullian*, || “ The Son was the Person  
 “ who *always* appear’d, convers’d and acted, by the  
 “ *Authority* and *Will* of the Father, because, *the*  
 “ *Son* can do nothing of himself, (Jo. 5. 19.)—thus  
 “ all things were made *By* the Son.”

*per eum facta sunt.*——*David*——adjecit: quoniam ipse  
 præcepit & creata sunt, &c. Cui ergo PRÆCEPIT? VERBO  
 scilicet, PER quod, inquit, Cœli firmati sunt, &c. [*Psal.* 33. v.  
 6.] *lib.* 3. c. 8.

\* Τὸ κελύεον τῶ καλεομένῳ μείζον τε καὶ κυριώτερον, ἐπεὶ  
 τὸ μὲν περὶ γαίται, τὸ δὲ περὶ τέτακται. (leg. vel. περὶ τέτακται,  
 vel ut edit. Massuet. ὑποτέτακται.) *lib.* 1. c. 9.

† Τὸν ὦν δὲ δέυτερον, δι’ ἧ πάντα ἐγένετο κατὰ βέλῃσιν τῶ  
 πατρός. *Sicrom.* 5. p. 598. edit. *Parif.*

‡ Τῶν τὸν λόγον ἔχε ὑπερῶν τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτῷ γεγεννημένων,  
 καὶ δι’ αὐτῶ τὰ πάντα πεποίηκεν. *ad Autolyc.* p. 81.

|| Filius visus est semper, & Filius conversatus est semper, &  
 Filius operatus est semper, ex auctoritate Patris & voluntate,  
 quia Filius nihil a semetipso potest facere——sic omnia per Filium  
 facta sunt. *Adv. Prax.* c. 15.

*Origen*

Origen explaining the Words of the Psalmist (Ps. 33. 9.) *for he spake, and they were made, he commanded, and they were created*, as the Greek Translation has it; says, \* “ The unbegotten God commanded the first-born of every Creature, and they were created——,” whence, he says, “ It appears, that the Word, being the *Minister* of the Creator, fram’d the World.”

On the same Account, he says, in another Place; † “ The Son is the *immediate Framer*, and, as it were, *Artificer* of the World, but the Father, in commanding the *Word* his Son to make the *World*, is *primarily* Creator.”

And the Council of *Antioch*, who met to condemn *Paul* of *Samosata*, declare their Faith saying; ‡ “ We believe, that he (the Son) having been always with the Father, fulfill’d the Father’s *Will* in the Creation of the Universe.”

*Eusebius* in like manner distinguisheth and says, “ || The Evangelist, in saying sometimes that  
M 2 “ the

\* Ἐνείλετο ὁ ἀγέννητος θεὸς τῷ πρωτοτόκῳ πάσης κτίσεως, καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν, &c.——ἀποδείκνυται ὅτι ὑπέρβητος τῷ δημιουργῷ γενόμενος ὁ λόγος τὸν κόσμον κατασκεύασε. *Com. in Joh. p. 61.*

† Λέγοντες τὸν μὲν προσεχῶς δημιουργὸν εἶναι τὸν ἡδὺν τῷ θεῷ λόγον, καὶ ὡς περὶ αὐτοῦ γὰρ τῷ κόσμῳ, τὸν δὲ πατέρα τῷ λόγῳ, τῷ προσεταχέναι τῷ ἡδὺν αὐτῷ λόγῳ ποιῆσαι, τὸν κόσμον, εἶναι, πρῶτως δημιουργόν. *Cont. Cels. lib. 6. p. 317.*

‡ Τῶτον πιστεύομεν σὺν τῷ πατρὶ ἀεὶ ὄντα ἐκπεπληρωμέναι τὸ πατρικὸν βέλημα πρὸς τὴν κτίσιν τῶν ὅλων. *Synod. Antioch. Non alium ostendit tunc adfuisse Deo cui praeceperentur haec opera ut fierent, nisi eum per quem facta sunt omnia, &c. Novat. c. 17. edit. Jackson.*

|| Λέγων δὲ (Εὐαγγελιστῆς) Δι’ αὐτῷ γεγεννηδαί ποτε μὲν τὸν κόσμον, ποτε δὲ τὰ πάντα, τὸ ὑπερβικλὸν τῷ θεῷ (λόγῳ) παρίσχει. Δυναίμενος γὰρ ὁ Εὐαγγελιστῆς εἰπεῖν πάντῃς ὅτι αὐτῷ ἐγένετο——ἐκ ὑπ’ αὐτῷ ἔφη, ἀλλὰ Δι’ αὐτῷ, ἵνα ἡμᾶς ἀναμύμη ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ὅλων ποιήσικην τῷ πατρὸς αὐθενσίαν. *Eccles. Theol. lib. 1. c. 20.* πῶς δὲ καὶ τὸ, πάντῃς Δι’ αὐτῷ ἐγένετο, ἔχει, ἐνδὸς ὅλῳ τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ; ἐ γὰρ ὑπ’ αὐτῷ, φησὶν, ἐξ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα κληρονομήσαι, ἀλλὰ Δι’ αὐτῷ. ἢ ΔΕ ΔΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΘΕΟΥ Τῷ ΤΗΡΗΤΙΚΟΝ σημαίνει—ἐτέρῳ μὲν ποιητικῷ  
τῷ

“ the World, sometimes that all Things were  
 “ made *By* (διὰ through) Him, shews the *minis-*  
 “ *terial* Agency of God the Word ; for whereas  
 “ he might have said that all Things were made  
 “ [ὕπ’ αὐτοῦ] *by him* (or of Him) as the efficient  
 “ Cause, he does not so express it, but thus ;  
 “ all Things were made *By Him* [as the *minis-*  
 “ *terial* Cause] that so he might refer us to the  
 “ *supreme efficient Power* of the Father, as the  
 “ *Maker of the Universe.*” Again, “ How will  
 “ it be consistently said, all Things were made  
 “ *By Him*, if he is the *same Being* with the Fa-  
 “ ther? For he does not say that all Things were  
 “ made [ὕπ’ αὐτοῦ] *by Him* [as the efficient Cause]  
 “ nor *OF* Him ; but that they were made [διὰ]  
 “ *By Him*, which implies his *ministerial* Agency—  
 “ another Person being *the Maker*, and He *mi-*  
 “ *nistring* to him. So that we must look for ano-  
 “ ther Person, who is absolutely *the Maker of the*  
 “ *Universe*, even that Person who gave Subsistence  
 “ to all Things *By* [διὰ] *Him* who is here still  
 “ *God.*——\* which being so, we must of Ne-  
 “ cessity acknowledge, that he whom the Evan-  
 “ gelist styles *God*, is not *the God supreme over*  
 “ *all* ; neither *the Father*, but his *only begotten*  
 “ *Son.*”

τῷ, αὐτῷ δὲ διακονησάμενος ὥσθ’ ἕτερον ζητεῖν τὴν ποιητὴν  
 ὅλων τὴν διὰ τοῦ θεολογούμενου τὰ πάντα ὑποσυστάμενον, *ibid. lib. 2.*  
*c. 14.* The force of this Reasoning of all the learned Antients  
 appears very strong to those who understand Greek and Latin :  
 for it is a Solecism and Absurdity in Language to say, that all  
 Things were made [διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ] *By him who is God absolutely*  
 or *the supreme God.*

\* Ὡς ἔτις ἐχόντων ὁμολογεῖν ἀνάγκη, τὸ θεολογούμενον  
 τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ μὴ τὸ ὅτι πάντων εἶναι θεόν, μηδ’ αὐτὸν  
 πατέρα, τὸν δὲ τέτε μονογενῆ υἱόν. *Euseb. Eccles. Theol.*  
*lib. 2. c. 14.*

Hence



Hence again the same *Eusebius* says, that Christ is [θεός] God, but not [ὁ πρῶτος θεός] \* *the supreme God*. And the primitive Council of *Antioch*, met against *Paul of Samosata*, declare it † *impious* to think, that the Son, who is the *Angel* of the Father, can be absolutely *the God of the Universe*; for that is to suppose the God of the Universe might be an *Angel* and sent. *Eusebius* says the same: and *Justin Martyr* frequently affirms, that the Son of God, who appear'd to the Patriarchs, &c. was not ‡ *absolutely the Maker of the Universe*; but his *Angel*, who minister'd to the Will of the *supreme Maker of the Universe*.

|| *Basil* himself, an *Athanasian*, agrees to this Doctrine. “ Let no one (says he) think that I affirm, that there are three *Supreme Agents*,—“ for there is but one *Original* of Things, who “ created them By the Son, and perfected them “ in the Spirit— you understand then there are “ three Beings, The Lord who *commanded*; the “ *Word* who *created*; the *Holy Ghost* who *establish'd* “ [the Things created.]

And *Cyril of Jerusalem* says, \*\* “ when the Father will'd that all Things shou'd be made, the “ Son created all Things at the *Command* of the

\* *Dem. Evang. p. 227.*

† Τὸν μὲν θεὸν ἦν ὅλων ἀσεβὲς ἄγγελον νομίσαι καλεῖσθαι. *Syn. Antioch.* ἔτε γὰρ τὸν ἐπέκεινα ἦν ὅλων θεὸν υἱὸν ἂν πρὸς εὐσεβίαν ἔειν. *Euseb. Eccles. Theolog. lib. 1. c. 7.*

‡ Οὐ τὴν ποιητὴν ἦν ὅλων. — τῇ τῷ ποιητῇ ἦν ὅλων θελήσει ὑπηρετῶν, *Dial. p. 73. edit. Paris.*

|| Καὶ μηδεὶς οἰέσθω με — τρεῖς εἶναι λέγειν ἀρχικάς ὑποστάσεις — ἀρχὴ γὰρ ἦν ὄντων μία, δι' οὗ δὴ δημιουργῆσαι, καὶ τελειῶσαι ἐν πνεύματι. — τρεῖς τοίνυν νοεῖς, τὸ προσάσσοντα κύριον, τὸ δημιουργῶντα λόγον, τὸ σερεῶντα τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, *De Spir. Sanct. c. 16.*

\*\* Πατέρες βεβηθέντες τὰ πάντα κατασκευάσαι, τὸ τῷ πατρὶ νεύματι ὁ υἱὸς τὰ πάντα ἐδημιούργησεν· ἵνα τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα τηρῇ τὸ πατεῖ τὴν αὐθεντικὴν ἐξουσίαν, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς δὲ πάλιν ἔχῃ ἐξουσίαν ἦν ἰδίῳν δημιουργημάτων, *Catech. 11.*

“ Fa-

“ Father. That the Father’s *Command* might se-  
 “ cure to him his *supreme Authority* ; and that the  
 “ Son might have Power over the Works which  
 “ he himself had made.”

And our own *Bishop Bull* confesseth, † “ That  
 “ the Doctrine, that the Father, as *supreme Mak-*  
 “ *er* giving his *Commands*, created all Things by  
 “ his Son, executing the *Command* and *Will* of  
 “ the Father, is so far from being *Arian*, that  
 “ even those Catholic Writers who liv’d after the  
 “ Council of *Nice*, and also were the most ear-  
 “ nest Opposers of the *Arian* Doctrine, made no  
 “ Scruple to profess it every where in their Wri-  
 “ tings.”

Lastly, as to the Objection of *two Gods*, we  
 have already shewn the Sense of the Primitive  
 Church, which is, that the Father only being *un-*  
*originated* and absolutely *supreme over all*, there is,  
 and can be, *no other God besides Him*. *Two Gods*,  
 in propriety of Speech, in the Account of Religion,  
 and in the Sense of the Antients, are *two unorigi-*  
*nated, two co-ordinate, two equal, two supreme, di-*  
*vine Persons or Gods*.

The next Text to be consider’d is *Heb.* i. v. 8,  
 9, 10. In the Exposition of which *Dr. W.* (to serve  
 his own Hypothesis) differs entirely from the An-  
 tients, whom he seems not to have consider’d or  
 consulted at all. He alledges (*p.* 490.) against the  
 Plea, that the Words *God even thy God*, v. 9. *ar-*  
*gue some Inferiority of God the Son* ; against this  
 he alledges “ that the Son is consider’d as *Man*,

\* Certe a Patre tanquam summo opifice quasi imperante,  
 per Filium Patris jussionem ac voluntatem exequentem, creata  
 fuisse omnia, adeo *Arianum* non est, ut etiam Catholici Doc-  
 tores, qui post Concilium *Nicenum* vixerunt, quiq; *Ariana*  
 hæresis acerrimi impugnatores fuere, passim illud in scriptis suis  
 adfirmare non sint veriti, *Def. F. N. Sect. 2. c. 9. § 10.*

“ and

“ and in his State of Humiliation.” But what say the Antients ?

*Irenæus* upon the Place (*Pf.* 45. 6, 7.) says, \*  
 “ The Spirit hath characteriz’d both the Persons  
 “ with the Title, *God* ; both the Son who is  
 “ anointed, and the Father who anoints him.”

In Agreement with *Irenæus* *Origen* says, †  
 “ that the Prophet declares that *this God*, whose  
 “ Throne is for ever and ever, is anointed by  
 “ *God* who is *his God*.”

And *Eusebius* of *Cæsarea*, “ † He who is de-  
 “ clar’d to be *God*, is said to love Righteousness  
 “ and hate Iniquity, and for this Cause is *anointed*  
 “ &c by another *Greater God*, who is his Father.”  
 Again, || “ wherefore, He who is *the supreme*  
 “ *God*, and a *Greater God*, and also *thy God*,  
 “ hath anointed Thee, O *God* ; so that he who  
 “ anoints is much *Superior* to him who is anoint-  
 “ ed.”

His second Pretense is (*p.* 488.) “ that the  
 “ Words (*v.* 10.) *Thou, Lord, in the Beginning hast*  
 “ *laid the Foundation of the Earth*, &c. are said of  
 “ *God the Son*, who is also *Jehovah* in the Psalm,  
 “ from whence these Words are taken.” He adds,  
 “ Cou’d there be any Words thought on either  
 “ plainer or stronger, to express a proper *Efficiency*  
 “ than those are ?” And so he goes triumphantly

\* Utroq; Dei appellatione signavit Spiritus, & eum, qui ungitur, Filium ; & eum qui ungit, id est, Patrem, *lib.* 3. c. 6.

† Κατανοήσας ὅτι θεῶν ὁμιλῶν ὁ προσφῆτης, ἔτι ὁ θρόνον ἔστιν εἰς αἰῶνα τῷ αἰῶνι, &c. τῷτον τὸν θεόν φησι κεχεῖσθαι ὑπὸ θεοῦ, ἢ ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ θεός, *cont. Cels.* lib. 1. p. 43.

‡ Αὐτὸς, ὁ δηλούμενος θεὸς εἶναι λέγεται ἡραπικῶς δικαιοσύνην καὶ μεμνηκῶς ἀδικίαν, καὶ τέττε χεῖρει ὑφ’ ἐτέρου ΜΕΙΖΟΝΟΣ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ κεχεισμένον ἐλαίῳ, &c. *Dem. Evang.* lib. 4. p. 192.

|| Διότι ἐπὶ τέττω ἔχεισέ σι, ὦ θεέ, ὁ ἀνωτάτω καὶ μείζων αὐτός, ὁ καὶ σὺ θεός, ὡς εἶναι καὶ τῷ χειρομένῳ τὸ χεῖροντα πολὺ πρῶτερον, *ibid.* lib. 4. c. 15.



on, as if he thought he had really prov'd something: not considering all the while, that he is only labouring to make *St. Paul* contradict himself, who had said just before v. 2. that *God made the Worlds* [Διὰ] *By his Son* [as the ministring Cause] *whom he appointed Heir of all Things*. Is this like making the Son the supreme *Jehovah*, the supreme efficient Author of the Universe? But as *Dr. W.* is ready to own the Antients to be the best Expositors of Scripture, let us hear them. The *Dr.* wou'd have it thought the Antients understood the Words of Christ, as he does, saying in his *Sermons* (p. 65.) that they were so understood in the fourth and fifth Centuries; and never otherwise than he knows of. But does he know of any one Antient, in the three first Centuries, that understood the Words of Christ? not one. But others know that the Antients unanimously understood the Words of God the Father. So \* *Irenæus* plainly understands them, and † *Tertullian* from this very place (with *Irenæus* and other Antients) proves the Son and Spirit to be the Hands of God, By which he wrought those Things which he made. And ‡ *Origen*, refering to the Words of the Psalm 102. 25, 27. plainly understands them of God the Father, whom, he stiles [πρῶτον θεόν] the supreme God, in Distinction to the Son, whom he stiles [δεύτερον] the second God. || *Eusebius* likewise, in his Comment upon the Psalm, understands the Words, of God the Father. And there is no Reason at all to think that the Apostle applys the Words to the Son, and

\* See lib. 4. c. 3. p. 230. edit. Massuet. & lib. 5. c. 6. where the Son and Spirit are call'd the Hands of God the Father.

† Hic est Dei dextra & manus ambæ, per quas operatus est ea quæ molitus est, opera enim manuum tuarum, inquit, *Cal.* *Advers. Hermog.* c. 45.

‡ Vid. *Orig. cont. Cels.* lib. 6. p. 318.

|| Vid. *Euseb. Com. in loc. Psal.*

not to the Father. To suppose them apply'd to the Son is making the Apostle use a needless Repetition, who had before, v. 2. said, that God by his Son *made the Worlds*. Secondly, they are aptly and naturally spoken of God the Father : That in them the Apostle might, by the Assertion of the *Omnipotence* and *Immutability* of God, confirm and give the highest Assurance of the Continuance of the Glory, and Dominion of Christ, to which God, his God, is represented to have exalted him, above the Angels, v. 8, 9. and which Exaltation is describ'd by his *sitting on God's right Hand*, v. 13. So that the Text and Context runs thus ; *Unto the Son, he saith, thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, a Scepter of Righteousness is the Scepter of thy Kingdom : Thou hast loved Righteousness and hated Iniquity, therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the Oil of Gladness above thy Fellows : and* [that we may not doubt of the *Stability* and *Continuance* of this Kingdom of Christ, it is given him by that supreme Lord, *Jehovah*, whose *Power* and *Immutability* the Psalmist elsewhere thus sets forth] *Thou, Lord, in the Beginning, hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, &c. They shall perish, but thou remainest — They shall be chang'd, but thou art the same.* And this Reasoning of the Apostle is very like our Saviour's own Reasoning, *Jo. 10. 28, 29.* Our Lord having told the Jews, that *he gave unto his Disciples eternal Life, and that they should never perish* ; he immediately adds, as a reason to confirm them in the assurance of what he promis'd, *my Father which gave them me is greater than all.* They might therefore depend upon his being able to perform what he promis'd, as having the *Power* and *Authority* of the Father who is *greater than all.* Dr. W. has \* offer'd some fri-

\* *First Defense*, p. 95. *Sermons*, p. 63.

volous pretences to favour his own Exposition and Hypothesis, which the Reader may consult if he pleases: it is sufficient for me, that, with the Reason of the Thing, I have all the Antients on my Side in the Application of the Passage, now consider'd, to God the Father of Christ.

Another Text which Dr. *W.* judges to favour his notion is *John* 10. 30. *I and my Father are one.* As if this meant, or could mean, that the Father and Son were *the same God.* The *Jews* indeed drew such an invidious Inference from these words, and charg'd our Saviour with *making himself God,* v. 33. The Unreasonableness of this Charge he confuted, v. 34, 35, 36. telling them, that he had affirm'd no more than that he was *the Son of God,* tho yet in their Law mere Men were call'd *Gods,* without offence. And the *Unity* intimated in the Expression of the *Father* and *him* being *one* is plainly, as the Context leads us to understand it, an *Unity of Concord and Power,* not of *metaphysical Substance*; Christ declaring to the *Jews* that his Sheep or Disciples were secure, by being in his Hand, of the Promise of *eternal Life,* which he gave them, v. 28. because v. 29. his *Father* who is *greater than all* had committed them unto him, and given him Power to confer *eternal Life* upon them: so that he being invested with the Power of his Almighty Father, their being in his Hand was the same as being in his Father's Hand; for thus, by a *communication* of Power to him from the Father, which he exercis'd in Agreement with the Will of the Father, *He and his Father are one.*

The same *Unity* which was between our Saviour and his Father our Lord prays may be in his Disciples, saying (*John* 17. 11, 21, 22.) *Holy Father, keep thro' thine own Name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be ONE, as we are:—That they all may be ONE, as thou Father art in me, and*



*I in thee, that they also may be ONE in us—— that they may be ONE, even as we are ONE. And thus the Antients unanimously understand it; and not one of 'em ever infer'd (except Tertullian, after he was a Montanist, and had left the Church) an Unity of Substance from this Passage; and Tertullian himself understood the Unity of Substance so, as that the Son was only a small Part [radius ex sole] of the immense Substance of the Father: and also explain'd the Words of Unity of Love, and Concord, between the Father and the Son.*

“ \* Concerning his Sheep also (our Lord says) “ that none cou'd take them out of his Hand. “ For my Father who gave them me is greater “ than all, and I and the Father are one. One “ Thing, he says, not one Person. For one Thing, “ in the neuter Gender, does not express Identity, “ but UNION, Likeness, Conjunction, the Love of “ the Father towards the Son, and the Obedience “ of the Son to the Will of his Father.

And Origen, “ † If any one is disturb'd at “ these Expressions, as if we favour'd the Opinion “ of those [the Sabellians] who deny the Father “ and the Son to be two distinct subsisting Beings, “ or Persons, let him consider that Text [*Acts* “ 4. v. 32.] *All that believ'd were of one Heart “ and one Soul*; and then he will understand this,

\* De ovibus etiam suis, quod nemo illas de manu ejus eriperet. Pater enim quod mihi dedit, majus est omnibus; ego & Pater unum sumus—unum sumus, non unus sumus—Unum dicit neutrali verbo; quod non pertinet ad singularitatem, sed ad unitatem, ad similitudinem, ad conjunctionem; ad dilectionem Patris qui Filium diligit, & ad obsequium Filii qui voluntati Patris obsequitur. *Adv. Prax. c. 22.*

† ΕΙ ΔΕ ΠΙΣ ΕΚ ΤΑΥΤΩΝ ΠΕΙΣΠΑΣΘΗΣΑΙ, ΜΗ ΠΙ ΑΥΤΟΜΑΛΩΜΕΝ  
 ΠΡΟΣ ΤΙΣ ΑΝΑΙΣΧΕΝΤΑΣ ΔΥΟ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΥΠΟΔΕΧΕΙΣ ΠΑΤΕΡΑ ΚΑΙ ΥΙΟΝ ΕΠΙΣΗ-  
 ΜΩ ΤΟ, ΉΝ ΔΕ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΘΣΣ ΠΣΕΥΤΑΝΤΩΝ Η ΚΑΡΔΙΑ ΚΑΙ Η ΨΥΧΗ ΜΙΑ.  
 ΟΑ ΘΕΩΡΗΣΗ ΤΟ, ΕΓΩ ΚΑΙ Ο ΠΑΤΗΡ ΕΝ ΕΣΜΕΝ.—ΘΕΠΟΚΕΥΟΜΕΝ  
 Ο ΤΟ ΠΑΤΕΡΑ ΤΗΣ ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑΣ, ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΥΙΟΝ ΤΗΝ ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑΝ, ΟΝΤΑ ΔΥΟ ΤΗ  
 ΠΙΣΤΑΣΙ ΠΕΡΕΧΜΑΤΑ, ΕΝ ΔΕ ΤΗ ΟΜΟΝΟΙΑ, ΚΑΙ ΤΗ ΣΥΜΦΩΝΙΑ, ΚΑΙ ΤΗ ΤΑΥ-  
 ΤΗΤΙ ΤΩ ΒΕΛΗΜΑΤΟΣ. *Cons. Cels. lib. 8. p. 386.*

" *I and my Father are one.*" To which he adds presently, " we worship therefore the Father of *Truth*, and also the Son who is *the Truth*, being *two Things* in Subsistence, but *ONE* in Agreement and Consent, and Sameness of Will."

And Hippolytus in like manner \*, " If he alledgeth that our Saviour hath said, *I and the Father are one* ; let him consider and he will perceive, that he did not say, *I and the Father AM one* ; but that we *ARE* one : for the Expression, *we ARE*, does not denote *one Person*, but *two Persons*, and *one Power*. And our Saviour Himself hath resolv'd the Matter, saying to his Father concerning his Disciples, *the Glory which thou gavest me I have given them, that they may be ONE, as we are ONE, &c.* [Job. 17. v. 22.]——What have the Noetians to say to this ? are all (Christ's Disciples) *one Body* in *Substance* ; or are we *one* in *Power* and *Unity of Mind and Purpose* ? In like Manner, the Son, who was sent, is one with the Father *in Power, and Concord.*"

And Novatian argues, † " If Christ was the Father, as the Heretics imagine, he should have  
" said,

\* Εάν δὲ λέγει, αὐτός ἐστιν, ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐσμέν, ἐπὶ εὐθέτω [leg. vel ἐπιστάτω vel ἐπιτενέτω] ἢ νῦν καὶ μανθανέτω, ὅτι ἐκ ἐστίν, ὅτι ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ΕΙΜΙ, ἀλλ' ἐν ΕΣΜΕΝ. τὸ γὰρ ΕΣΜΕΝ ἐκ ἐφ' ἐνὸς λέγεται, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ δύο πρόσωπα ἑστάναι, ΔΥΝΑΜΙΝ δὲ μίαν. αὐτὸς δὲ αὐτὸ ἀπέλυσεν, εἰπὼν πρὸς μαθητῶν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, τὴν δόξαν ἣν ἔδωκας μοι, ἔδωκα αὐτοῖς. ἵνα ᾧσι ἐν, καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἐν. &c.——τί πρὸς ταῦτα ἔχουσιν λέγειν οἱ Νοτιανοί, μὴ πάντες ἐν σῶμα' ἐσιν κατὰ τὴν εἰσάν, ἢ τῇ δυνάμει καὶ τῇ διαθέσει τῆς ὁμοφροσύνης ἐν γινόμεναί τ' αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον ὁ πᾶσι ὁ πεμφθεὶς——ὡμολόγησεν εἶναι ἐν τῷ πατρὶ δυνάμει, διαθέσει [leg. καὶ διαθέσει] *Cont. Nov. l. 7. edit. Fabric.*

† Si enim erat, ut hæretici putant, *Pater* Christus, oportuit dicere, *ego Pater unus sum*. At cum *ego* dicit, deinde *Patrem* infert, dicendo, *ego & Pater*, proprietatem personæ suæ, id est,  
Fili

“ said, *I the Father am one* [one Person] but in  
 “ saying *I*, then adding the *Father*, and saying, *I*  
 “ and the *Father*, he separates and distinguisheth  
 “ his own proper Person, as being the *Son*, from  
 “ the *Authority* of the Person of the *Father*; not  
 “ only in the mere Sound of *Name*, but also in the  
 “ Order and Disposition of *Power*.”

Lastly, *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria* agrees to  
 the same Sense of the Text, and observes, “ that  
 “ our Lord in the \* Words, *I and the Father*  
 “ are one, did not stile Himself the *Father*; or  
 “ signify that their *two Natures* in Subsistence were  
 “ one: but that the Son was the *exact Resemblance*  
 “ of the *Father*, and the perfect Likeness of Him  
 “ by Nature.”

From the precedent Sense of the Antients upon  
 the Text *Joh. 10. 30.* it appears, that as the  
 Text was urg'd by the *Sabellians*, in Favour of their  
 Notion of an *Unity of Substance* in the *Father* and  
 the *Son*; so that Sense of it was constantly deny'd  
 by the Catholics, as confounding the divine Per-  
 sons: whence it follows, that the antient Church  
 thought an *Unity of Substance* was capable of no  
 other but a *Sabellian* Sense, which was opposite  
 to the Catholic Doctrine, that the *Father* and the  
*Son* were, as *Alexander* expresses it, [τῇ ὑποστασει δυο  
 φύσεις] *two Natures* distinct in Subsistence, or two  
 distinct subsisting Beings or Agents.

Another Text, which *Dr. W.* thinks to establish  
 his Notion by, is *Rom. 9. v. 5* — *Of whom, as*

*Filii, a paterna auctoritate discernit atq, distinguit, non tantum  
 modo de sono NOMINIS, sed etiam de ordine dispositæ Po-  
 testatis. Novat. c. 27. edit. Jackson.*

† Ὅπερ φησιν ὁ κύριος ὁ πατήρ αὐτὸν ἀναγορεύων, ἡ δὲ τῆς  
 τῇ ὑποστασει Δύο ΦΥΣΕΙΣ μίαν εἶναι σαφηνίζων· ἀλλ' ὅτι τὴν  
 πατρικὴν ἐμφέρεται ἀκρίβως πέφυκε σῶζειν ὁ υἱὸς τῶ πατρὸς, τὴν  
 κατὰ πάντα ὁμοιότητα αὐτῶ ἐκ φύσεως ἀπομαζόμενος, *Epist.*  
*apud Theodoret. lib. I. c. 4.*

concerning



*concerning the Flesh, Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever.*

This Text the *Tritheistic-Orthodox* on one Hand, and the *Sabellian-Orthodox* on the other Hand, are apt to triumph in, making no Question at all but that the Words, *who is over all God blessed for ever*, are undoubtedly ascrib'd to Christ, and that hence he is prov'd according to the one, to be *the same God with the Father*, in the *Gnostic, Sabellian* Sense ; or according to the other, by a directly contrary Interpretation, to be distinctly from the Father *God supreme over all*, in the *Tritheistic* Sense. And thus our Saviour is in the Text, as it were, again crucify'd between *two Thieves*, two Heresies equally destructive of his true Divinity. And it is not consider'd in either of them, that if the Words were really spoken of Christ, *St. Paul* himself has enter'd a *Caveat* against both the Senses, saying, *1 Cor. 15. 27, 28. For he (God the Father, v. 24.) hath put all Things under his (Christ's) Feet ; but when he saith, all Things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, who did put all Things under Him—and the Son himself shall be subject unto him, that did put all Things under him.*

Before I shew the Sense of the Antients upon the preceding Text, I will make a few Observations upon it.

1<sup>st</sup>. In the Text the Word (*θεός*) *God* is wanting in several Antient Latin MSS. of *Cyprian*, and it is doubtful whether *Cyprian* read it in his Copy or not. The Reason which *Dr. Mills* gives, that *Cyprian* must have had it, viz. because he follows the same Translation of the Scriptures which *Tertullian* follow'd, who had it in his Copy, is not a good one ; because any one upon comparing the Citations of *Tertullian* and *Cyprian* together, as I have carefully done, will have reason to conclude, they

they did not follow the same Translation. *Grotius* observes, that the Word was not in the *Syriac Version*. *Mills* finds Faults with *Grotius* as being incorrect in this Observation, and thinks it was in the *Syriac Version*. But *Mills* wou'd have had Reason to have judg'd otherwise, had he read *Ephraem* the *Syrian Writer*, who twice cites the Text, and in both Places omits the \* Word (*θεός*) God. *Dr. Mills* also (who was a very indiligent Reader of the Fathers) pretends, that *Irenæus* both read the Word (*θεός*) God in the Text, and withal alledg'd it in Proof of the Divinity of Christ; which is a gross Mistake. For tho the Word is indeed inserted in the Text in *Irenæus*, yet it seems plainly an Interpolation, because *Irenæus* neither explains at all the Words, *who is over all God Blessed*, nor infers from them that Christ is God: but cites, what he did cite, only to prove that † *Jesus Christ was one and the same Person*, which he proves from the Words, *of whom according to the Flesh Christ came*; and the Words following being nothing at all to *Irenæus's* Argument, but rather seeming to weaken it, it is not, I think, probable that he here cited them, and 'tis certain he no where useth them to prove the Divinity of Christ, as *Mills* pretends. The Text, with the Word (*θεός*) God in it, is also cited by the Antient Council of *Antioch* in their Synodic Epistle, and they cite it to prove the Divinity of Christ; but not to prove his supreme Divinity, or that he is over all God Blessed: this they deny in this very Epistle. But they alledge only in Proof of it the Words, *who is over all*, either having not in their Copy the Word (*θεός*) God, tho' it is now read

\* P. 43, 136. edit. Gr. Oxon.

† UNUM & eundem esse Jesum Christum. lib. 3. c. 16. edit. Massuet.

there; or applying it to God the Father, whom alone they stile absolutely (*ὁ θεὸς τῶν ὅλων*) *the God of the Universe*.

*Origen* is another whom *Dr. Mills* refers to, as having the Word (*θεός*) *God*, in his Comment upon the Text; but he unfairly puts upon us his Interpreter and Interpolator *Ruffinus*, instead of *Origen* Himself.

2dly. Admitting the Word (*θεός*) *God* to have been originally in the Text, the Question will be, what is the true meaning of it: for the Words are of ambiguous Construction. They may either signify, *of whom Christ came: God who is over all be blessed for ever*; or, *of whom Christ came, who is over all: God be blessed for ever*; or, *of whom Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever*. That which favours the last Interpretation of the Words is, that in the stile of Scripture, where it is said, *God be blessed*, or *blessed be God*, the order of the Greek is different viz. [*ἐυλογητὸς ὁ θεός*] *blessed be God*. And this Observation is true, both with Respect to the stile of the *Septuagint*, and of the *New Testament*: but then in Favour of the first and second Construction of the Words, it is to be taken Notice of, that neither *St. Paul* or any of the Apostles or Evangelists do any where else in Scripture, ascribe unto Christ the Expression, *God over all*, or the *blessed God*; on the contrary, these Titles are peculiarly attributed to God the Father, even in Contradistinction to \* *Christ*. And he is emphatically stil'd *the Blessed*, *Mar. 14. 61. Rom. 1. 25. 2 Cor. 11. 31*. In which last place the Words [*ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας*] *who is blessed for evermore*, and which are spoken of the God and Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, are parallel to those in the Text before us. So that the

\* See *Luc. 1. 68. 2 Cor. 1. 3. Ephes. 1. 3, 4, 6. 1 Pet. 1. 3*



Words may well be understood as a Doxology to God the Father, for sending Christ in our Flesh to redeem us.

3dly. With respect to the Sense of the Antients relating to this Text, it does not appear certain that any of them besides *Tertullian*, when a *Montanist*, and *Cyprian* and *Novatian* (probably from *Tertullian*) did apply the Words to Christ. Yet none of these, as might have been expected, ever infer'd from them, that Christ was *God supreme over all*; they knowing that *all Things were deliver'd unto Him from his Father*, Matt. 11. 27. and that *when all Things were put under him, he is excepted who did put all Things under Him*, 1 Cor. 15. 27.

*Clemens Romanus*, an Apostolical Writer, intimates that he did not understand the Words, *who is over all, God blessed for ever*, to be spoken of Christ. For in refering to the Text he says, that from *Jacob* came \* *the Lord Jesus according to the Flesh*, adding no more; nor ever any where in his Epistle, styling Christ so much as barely *God* at all, tho' here he had an opportunity of doing it scarce to be miss'd, had he thought the latter Part of the Verse (*Rom. 9. 5.*) was meant of Christ: and from his not applying the Words to Christ it is reasonable to conclude, that he thought they were by the Apostle understood of *God the Father only*, whom in this Section he styles [*ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεός*] *the God supreme over all*. Hence also the Reason appears why *Clemens* never calls Christ *God*; viz. because *St. John's Gospel* being not written when he wrote this Epistle, and not understanding the Word *God* in the Text of *St. Paul* to be as-

\* Εξ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς τὸ κατὰ σὰρκα. *Epist. ad Corinth.* Sect. 32. edit. Wot. & Cot.

crib'd to Christ, he did not find that Christ was call'd *God* in any Part of Scripture known to him, or then written. And to this Purpose it is farther observable, that when he seems to allude (*Sect.* 36.) to some Parts of the first Chapter of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, as verse, 3, 4, 5, 7, yet he takes no Notice of Christ's being stil'd *God*, v. 8. tho' he is speaking the highest Things which could be said of him. This looks as if he did not really know any Thing of this Epistle, but only as having convers'd with and been taught by St. *Paul*, he might remember and use several Expressions which are found in this Epistle.

\* *Hippolytus*, in whose Book against *Noetus* the Text is found, and applied to Christ, gives it for the Reason of his being *God over all*, that all Things were deliver'd unto Him from his Father: and so he was [παντοκράτωρ] *Almighty*; but then he says he was constituted *Almighty* by the Father: which shews that he did not think Christ *supreme God over all*, or equally *Almighty* with the Father. But it must be own'd that this Work of *Hippolytus* is very much interpolated; and so 'tis hard to know what he really wrote.

Therefore as far as it appears, it was the undoubted Sense of the Antient Church, that the Title [ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων, or ὁ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεός] *God over all*, so peculiarly belong'd to the *Father*, that it was accounted *Heresy*, *Blasphemy*, and *Impiety* to ascribe it unto Christ. Whence, I think, it plainly follows, that they who taught this as the Doctrine of the Church must understand the Words, *who is over*

\* Οὗτος ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός ἐστὶ λέγει γὰρ—πάντα μὴ παρεδέδωκεν ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς. *Cons. Noet.* § 6. edit. *Fabric.* Παρ' ἐκείνου παρὰ πατρὸς κατεστάθη. *ibid.*

all God blessed for ever, of the Father; and there being no Text besides this, wherein God or the Father is stil'd (ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός) *God over all*, that Doctrine was probably deduc'd from this Text amongst others.

A very Antient and Excellent Book, entitled the *Apostolic Constitutions*, informs us, that some of the *Simonian Gnostic Heretics* \* taught, that *Jesus was the God over all*, thinking him to be *his Father*. In opposition to which Heresy the Church taught † “that the *Father is God over all*; Christ is God “the only begotten;—the Holy Ghost is the “Comforter by Christ.”

*Ignatius*, a Writer of the apostolic Age, the larger Epistles ascribed to whom have been prov'd to be genuine beyond all reasonable Exception, makes the Assertion that Christ is *God over all* to be the Doctrine of the *Devil*, whom, on this Account, he thus accosts; ‡ “Why dost thou not think “that Christ was born of a Virgin, but that he “is *the God over all*, He who *absolutely is*, *supreme over all*? Say then, who is it that *sent* “him? Who is he that bears rule *over him*? And “whose *Will* is it that he obeys?”

Again, || “wherefore that he is not *the God over all*, even the *Father*, but his *Son*, he himself

O 2

“self

\* Ἐλεγε δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸ Ἰησοῦν τὸ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸν ὑποπτεύουσιν, αὐτὸν ἑαυτοῦ πατέρα δοξάζοντες, &c. *Const. Apost. lib. 6. c. 26. edit. Cot. a Cler.*

† Πατὴρ ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός· Χριστὸς ὁ μονογενὴς θεός· — πνεῦμα ἄγιον ὁ παρεκκλησίᾳ, τὸ ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ πεμπομένον, *ibid. lib. 3. c. 17.*

‡ Πῶς δὲ πάλιν ἐκ ἐπὶ σοι δοκεῖ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶναι ἐκ τῆ παρ-  
κένου, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, ὁ ὢν, ὁ παντοκράτωρ; τίς ἔν τῷ  
κατὸν ἀποδείξει, εἰπέ; τίς ὁ τέλει κρείων; γνώμη δὲ πν-  
ῶς ἐπειθάρχησε; *Ignat. Epist. ad Philip. § 7.*

|| Ὅτι ἐκ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός καὶ πατὴρ, ἀλλὰ ὅς  
ἐκείνος, λέγει· ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸ πᾶν με καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν,

καὶ



“ self saith, *I ascend unto my Father and your Fa-*  
 “ *ther, and unto my God and your God: and when*  
 “ *all Things are put under him, then shall he be sub-*  
 “ *ject unto him who put all Things under him, that*  
 “ *God may be all in all: wherefore he who put all*  
 “ *Things under him, and is all in all, is one person,*  
 “ *and he whom they are put under, and who also*  
 “ *himself with all Things will be made subject,*  
 “ *is another Person.”*

And Origen says \* “ admit there are some, a-  
 “ mongst a Multitude of Believers of different  
 “ Opinions, who rashly affirm, that our Saviour  
 “ is *the God over all*; yet we do not affirm this, as  
 “ believing him who hath said, *My Father is*  
 “ *greater than I.*”

And Irenæus before him every where supposes  
 the God over all to be the Person of the Father. †

“ By him [of or from him] who is *the God over all*,  
 “ all things were appointed and made by [per  
 “ thro’] his Word, [as the ministring Cause].”

καὶ θεόν με καὶ θεὸν ὑμῶν καὶ, ὅταν ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, τὸ  
 καὶ αὐτὸς ὑποταγήσεται τῷ ὑποτάξαντι αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα. ἵνα ὁ  
 θεὸς τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν ἐκέν ἕτερός ἐστιν ὁ ὑποτάξας καὶ ὡς τὰ  
 πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν, καὶ ἕτερος ὢ ὑπεράγῃ, ὃς καὶ μετὰ πάντων ὑπο-  
 τάσσειται. *Epist. ad Iarsens. §. 5.* and a little before he said, it is  
 the Doctrine of the Ministers of Satan, ὅτι αὐτὸς (ὁὗτος) ἐστιν  
 ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, that the Son is God over all. *ibid. §. 2.*

\* Ἐξω δὲ τινὰς ὡς ἐν πλήθει πεινούντων καὶ δεχομένων δια-  
 φωνίαν διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν ὑποτίθεσθαι ὅτι σωτὴρα εἶναι τὸν  
 πᾶσι θεόν· ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς τοιούτων, οἱ καθόμενοι αὐτῷ λέγοντες  
 ὁ πατὴρ ὁ πέμψας με μέζων μου ἐστίν. *Adv. Cels. lib. 8. p. 387.*

† Ab eo, qui *super omnes est Deus*, & constituta sunt & facta  
 per verbum ejus, *etc. lib. 3. c. 8. edit. Massuet.* Pater enim  
 conditionem simul & verbum suum portans, & verbum porta-  
 tum a Patre præstat Spiritum omnibus, quemadmodum vult  
 Pater. — & sic unus Deus Pater ostenditur, qui est *super*  
*omnia*, & per omnia, & in omnibus. Super omnia quidem Pa-  
 ter, & ipse est Caput Christi; per omnia autem Verbum, &  
 ipse est caput Ecclesiæ; in omnibus autem nobis Spiritus, *etc.*  
*lib. 5. c. 18.*

Again, he hath these remarkable Words, “ The Father *upholding* the *Creation* and his *Word*, and the *Word* being *upheld* by the Father, gives the *Spirit* to all, as the Father *wills*.—And thus it is manifest there is but *one God* even the Father, who is *above all*, and *thro’ all*, and *in all*: The Father is *above all*, who is also the *Head of Christ*; his *Word* is *thro’ all*, who is also the *Head of the Church*; and his *Spirit* is in us all, &c.”

Eusebius of *Cæsarea* teaches the same Doctrine, \* “ as Christ (says he) was not a sensible Light, so neither was he himself *the God who is over all*.”

Again, † “ the Evangelist does not say, that the *Word* was God absolutely with the Article; lest thereby he should be affirm’d to be *the God over all*.”

Again, ‡ “ no one can piously affirm that the Son is *the God over all*.”

Again, || “ If, as *Marcellus* imagines, he who is absolutely God, and the *Word* which is in him, be *one* and *the same Being*; it follows that he who was begotten in the Holy Virgin, and was made *Flesh*, and became *Man*, and suffer’d what is written of him, and died for our Sins, the same was *the God over all*, which *Sabellius* having dar’d

\* Ὡς δὲ ἐκ αἰδηλὸν ἐπύργχανε φῶς, ἕτως ἐδὲ τὸ ἐπὶ κείνῳ τῶν ὅλων αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς ἦν. *Eccles. Theolog. lib. 1. c. 20.*

† Οὐκ εἰπὼν, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν ὁ θεὸς μετὰ τῆς τῆς αἰσθητικῆς θεότητος. ἵνα μὴ αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸ ἐπὶ πάντων [θεὸν] δεῖσθαι. *ibid. lib. 2. c. 14.*

‡ Οὐτε γὰρ τὸν ἐπὶ κείνῳ τῶν ὅλων θεὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ εἰπὼν εὐσεβὴς ἦεν. *ibid. lib. 1. c. 7.*

|| Εἰ δὲ ὡς EN καὶ TATTON ἦν ὁ θεὸς καὶ ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ λόγος, ὡς δοκεῖ Μαρκέλλῳ, ὁ ἐν ἀρίστῳ πασθένῳ γεννώμενος καὶ σαρκωθεὶς καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσας καὶ παθὼν τὰ ἀναγεγραμμένα καὶ ἀποθανὼν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, ὃ δὴ πολυήσαστα εἶναι τὸν Σαβέλλιον ἢ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν θεῶν ἐν ἀθέοις καὶ βλασφημίαις ἐγκατέλεξεν. *ibid. lib. 2. c. 4.*

“ to

“ to affirm, was esteem’d by the Church of God  
 “ to be an *Atheist* and *Blasphemer*.”

Lastly, \* “ The Evangelist (says he) cou’d have  
 “ stil’d the Word [*ὁ θεός*] *God absolutely*, had he  
 “ thought the Father and Son to have been *one*  
 “ *and the same Being*; and that the Word was *the*  
 “ *God over all*.——But now by stiling the Father  
 “ [*ὁ θεός*] *God absolutely*, and the Word barely (*θεός*)  
 “ *God*, or a *divine Person*, he has plainly taught us  
 “ to esteem the Father of the Word, with whom  
 “ the Word was, to be *the supreme God over all*;  
 “ and next after him to understand that the Word,  
 “ who is his only-begotten Son, is not *the God over*  
 “ *all*, but that he is a *divine Person*.”

From the foregoing Testimonies it is evident,  
 that it was the Doctrine of the primitive Church,  
 that the Title of *God over all* was so peculiarly as-  
 crib’d to God the Father in the Scriptures, that it  
 was *Blasphemy* and *Impiety* to ascribe it to the Son of  
 God: whence I conclude that the Words of the  
 Text, *Rom. 9. 5. who is over all God blessed for ever*,  
 were by the antient Church generally understood  
 and interpreted, as spoken of God the Father.  
 And *Tertullian*, † *Cyprian*, and *Novatian*, who at-  
 tributed

\* ΔυνάμενΘ γὰρ εἰπεῖν, καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγΘ μετὰ τῆς τῆς  
 ἁρθευ προσθήκης, εἰ γὰρ ἐν καὶ ταυτὸν ἠγείτο τὸ πατέρα εἶναι καὶ τὸ  
 υἱόν, αὐτὸν τε εἶναι τὸν λόγον τὸν ὅτι πάντων θεὸν——ἔνι δὲ  
 περιπεπῶν, καὶ ὁ λόγΘ ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν——καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγΘ,  
 μονογενὲς σαφέστερον ἡμᾶς διδάσκων, πρῶτον μὲν ἠγείσθαι θεὸν  
 τὸν ἐπὶ κεῖνα τῶν ὄλων, αὐτὸν τὸν τῆς λόγου πατέρα, πρὸς ὃν ἦν ὁ  
 λόγΘ· ἔπειτα μετὰ αὐτὸν, μὴ ἀγνοεῖν ὡς καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτὸς ὁ  
 μονογενὲς υἱός, ἐχὼ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, ἀλλ’ ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς  
 θεὸς ἦν. *Eccles. Theolog. lib. 2. c. 17.*

† The one supreme God all thro’ *Cyprian*’s Writings is the  
 Person of the Father, who he says “ is the *one God who is*  
 “ *Lord of all*, of *unequall’d Majesty and Power*.” *Unus igitur*  
*omnium Dominus est Deus; neque enim illa sublimitas potest*  
*habere consortem, cum sola omnem teneat potestatem. De homo-*  
*patientia. p. 14.* *Tertullian*’s and *Novatian*’s Opinion have been  
 shewn



tributed this Text to our Saviour, nevertheless still confess'd that the Father only was *the God supreme, or over all*. Nay *Basil* Himself, an *Athanasian*, shews, that the Title of *God over all* peculiarly belongs to God the Father, saying; \* “ It is the “ peculiar *Characteristic* of his Person who is *God over all* to be the *Father*, and to have no Cause “ of his Existence.”

Having shewn that the Texts of Scripture, which *Dr. W.* principally urgeth in Favour of his own Notion, are full and clearly against it; and were understood and interpreted by the antient Church, in a Sense quite contrary to it; I proceed to shew the Sense of the primitive Church upon some other Texts, which teach a Doctrine directly opposite to his Hypothesis.

*Mat. 19. v. 17. Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God.* This Text was understood by all the † Antients as spoken of God the Father, the *Original, supreme, deriv'd Good*; the Son being the *Image*, as of the *Person*, so of the *Goodness* of God the Father.

|| *Irenæus* cites the Text as if it had been written, *why callest thou me Good, there is but one Per-*

shewn above, and will be farther shewn hereafter. *Cyprian* elsewhere to the same Purpose says, that Christ call'd the Father his Lord and God, &c. *Dominum & Deum suum*; ——— quando ipsam potestatem, quâ baptizamur, & sanctificationem ab eodem Patre Christus acceperit; quem majorem dixerit, a quo clarificari petierit; cujus voluntatem, usq; ad obsequium bibendi calicis & subeundæ mortis, impleverit. *Epist. ad Jubaian. p. 203.*

\* ‘Ο δὲ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς ἑξαιρέτων τὴ γνώσειμα τὴ ἑαυτοῦ ὑποστάσεως τὸ πατὴρ εἶναι, ἐκ μηδενὸς αἰτίας ὑποστῆναι μόνον. *Basil. Epist. 43.* concerning the Difference of the Words, *patris* and *hypostasis*.

† *Just. Mart.* Εἷς ἐστὶν ἀγαθός, ὁ πατὴρ μὲν ὁ ἐν τοῖς ἑξανοῖς. There is one who is good, even my Father who is in Heaven, *Dial. cum Tryph.*

|| Εἷς ἐστὶν ἀγαθός, ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τοῖς ἑξανοῖς. *lib. 1. c. 20. edit. Massuet.* Quem solum merito bonum pronuntiat Dominus: cujus bonitatis totus testis est mundus, *Novatian. c. 4.*

son who is good, my Father which is in Heaven. And so \* Clemens Alexandrinus cites it. Clemens elsewhere explains his sense of the Text saying, "whom our Saviour and God declares to be alone Good, even God the Father." Again, "that He who is truly alone the one God supreme over all, may be declar'd also to be Good for ever and ever, saving us by his Son."

† Origen remarkably says, "our Saviour says, the Father that sent me is Greater than I; and therefore refus'd to accept the Title of Good, in the proper, true, and perfect Sense of it, when offer'd to him, but refer'd it gratefully to the Father, and rebuk'd him who wou'd have thus glorify'd the Son above Measure." The Reason which he adds is, that the Son is not in any Thing comparable to the Father; "for that he is [not the

\* *Paedagog.* lib. 1. "Ὁν μόνον ὄντα θεὸν πατέρα ἀγαθὸν χαρι-  
πείζει ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ θεός. *Ibid.* *Strom.* 7. ὅπως—ὁ πᾶς ὁ  
μόνος εἰς παντοκράτωρ ἀγαθὸς ἀναφαίνηται θεὸς ἐξ αἰῶν ὃς  
αἰῶνα σῶζων διὰ υἱῶν. *Strom.* 7. p. 835. edit. Oxon.

† Πειθομενοι τῷ σωτῆρι λέγοντι· ὁ πατὴρ ὁ πέμψας με μείζων  
μέ ἐστι, καὶ διὰ τῆς μὴ ἐνεγκόνῃς μηδὲ τὴν, ΑΓΑΘΟΣ, προσ-  
γορίαν τὴν κυρίαν καὶ ἀληθῆ καὶ τελείαν παραδέξασθαι αὐτὸν προσ-  
φερομένην, ἀλλὰ ἀναφέρειν αὐτὴν εὐχαιρίως τῷ πατρί [ita placet  
legendum, non ut in edit. πνεύματι, quæ corruptio fiebat ex errore  
librarii scribentis πνι, i. e. πνεύματι pro περι i. e. πατρί, quod non  
videbat Clariss. Huetius] μετ' ἐπισημείωσης πρὸς τὸν βελλόμενον  
ὑπερδοξάζειν γὰρ τὸν υἱόν.—εὐ συγκρίνεται κατ' ἐξὲν τῷ πατρί.  
εἰκὼν γὰρ ἐστὶ τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ. *Com. in Joh.* p. 218. καὶ δὲ  
εἰδέναι ὅτι ἐνλαύθα μὲν κυρίως τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τετακται  
μόνον—καὶ μὴ ἐφ' ἐτέρι πνός.—καὶ παντὸς δὲ τῷ ὑποδεεστέ-  
ρῳ ἐφαρμόζεται ἢ, ἀγαθόν, φωνή, ἄλλο σημαίνονμενον ἔχει τὸ ἐπ'  
αὐτῷ λέγονμενον. εἴπερ ὡς μὲν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εἰκὼν ἐστὶν ἀγα-  
θότης, ὡς δὲ πρὸς τὰ λοιπὰ, ὅπερ ἢ τῷ πατρί ἀγαθότης πρὸς  
αὐτόν. ἢ καὶ μᾶλλον ἐστὶ πᾶσι ἀναλογίαν προσεχῆς εἰδέναι ἐπὶ ἀγα-  
θότητι τῷ θεῷ πρὸς τὸν σωτῆρα ὄντα εἰκόνα τῆς ἀγαθότη-  
τος αὐτοῦ, ἢ περ ἐπὶ τῷ σωτῆρι πρὸς ἀγαθὸν ἄνθρωπον—παλιν γὰρ  
ἢ ὑπερβολὴ πρὸς τὰ ὑποδεεστέρα ἀγαθὰ ἐν τῷ σωτῆρι καθὼς ἐστὶ  
εἰκὼν τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ, ἢ περ ἢ ὑπερβολὴ τῷ θεῷ ὄντι  
ἀγαθῷ πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα σωτῆρα· ὁ πατὴρ ὁ πέμψας με μείζων μέ  
ἐστι. *Com. in Mat.* p. 376, 377.

Original

" *Original Good* but] the *Image* of the Father's *Goodness*."

Again, " the Appellation of *Good*, properly so called, is in the Text attributed to him only " who is absolutely God:"—and to no other " Person besides—and when apply'd to an inferior Person, it hath another Signification—that our Saviour is the *Image* of the Father's *Goodness*; and that his *Goodness* is the same, or " greater, in proportion to the *Goodness* of others, " than the *Goodness* of the Father is to his *Goodness*."

\* *Eusebius* agrees to *Origen's* Sense, that the Son, tho *good*, is not the *original supreme Good*; but the *Image* of the Father's *Goodness*, who only is the *original, absolute, underiv'd Good*. So that the Sense of the antient Church plainly is, that as the Father only, who is unoriginated, is the *one God supreme over all*, so he is alone supreme and absolutely perfect in respect of every divine Attribute: and that all the Perfections of the Son, and amongst these his *Goodness*, being deriv'd to him with his Nature from the Father, are not co-ordinate or equal to the underiv'd Perfections of the Father, and so, that the Attribute of *Goodness* cannot belong to the Son in the same high and absolute Sense, in which it is ascrib'd to the Father, to whose supreme *Goodness*, our Saviour himself in the Text before us yields the *Pre-eminence*. And as our Saviour declar'd, that the Attribute of *Goodness* so peculiarly and eminently belong'd to his Father, that it cou'd not be ascrib'd to himself in the same high Sense and Degree of Perfection: so he has also declar'd, that the Perfection of absolute

\* Καὶ ἐξέτασις περὶ τοῦ υἱὸς μαθήσει ὅπως ἐστὶ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀγαθός· ἐπέπερ——εἰκὼν ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ (πατρὸς) Com. in Gal. 72.



*Knowledge* is the peculiar Attribute of the Father only. " But of that Day and Hour knoweth no one [*ἔδειξ* no Person] no not the Angels of Heaven, *but my Father ONLY*, Mat. 24. 36. But " of that Day and that Hour knoweth no one " [*ἔδειξ* no Person] no not the Angels which are " in Heaven, neither the *Son*, but the *Father*, Mar. " 13. v. 32." Than which no Words or Language can more plainly and strongly exprefs, that our Lord and Saviour did not then know the Day of Judgment spoken of in these Texts ; that being one of those Things which, as Christ told his Disciples after his Resurrection, " the Father had put " in his own Power," *Acts* 1. 7. And which was reserv'd to be reveal'd to Him after his Exaltation to the Throne of God in Heaven. The Book of the *Revelation* is therefore call'd, *the Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto Him*, Ch. 1. v. 1. And the Knowledge of the future State of the Church which had been in Part, and more obscurely, reveal'd to the Prophet *Daniel*, was more fully and clearly reveal'd to Christ, as the Reward of his Sufferings and Redemption of us. *Rev.* 5. v. 1—9. Dr. *W.* has nothing to alledge against the plain meaning of the precedent Texts, but the absurd *Cerinthian* distinction between the \* *humane* and *divine Person* (which he unphilosophically calls the humane and divine Nature) of Christ : as if Christ knew any Thing which his entire *Person* knew not ; or his *Nature*, distinct from his *Person*, cou'd be said to know any Thing at all. The Scripture has prevented all such Quibbles (which tend only to make the Doctrines of Christ ridiculous) by expressly declaring, that the *Son* did not know the Day of Judgment, and that the *Father*

\* See a Reply to Dr. *Waterland's* Defense of some Queries by a Clergyman in the Country, *Qu.* 7. p. 236, &c.

only knew it. So that there is no possible Way for Dr. W. to infer that the Son knew it, but by supposing him to be *the Person* of the Father, or the same individual intelligent Agent with the Father; and to differ from the Father, not in *Person*, but merely in *Name*.

That the Antients understood the Son in the Text to be Christ in his highest Capacity, to be not merely the Son of Man, but the very Son of God Himself, I shall prove from two unquestionable Writers, *Irenæus* and *Origen*, who deliver the Doctrine of the Church. “ \* Being unreasonably “ puffed up (says *Irenæus* to the *Gnostics*) ye pre- “ sumptuously take upon you to say, that you “ know the unutterable Mysteries of God; when “ even our Lord, the Son of God Himself, confess’d, “ that the Father alone knew the Day and Hour of “ Judgment; expressly affirming, of that Day and “ Hour knoweth no one, neither the Son, but the “ Father only. If therefore the Son was not ashamed “ to refer the Knowledge of that Day to the Fa- “ ther, but said *what was true*; then surely nei- “ ther shou’d we be ashamed to reserve to God “ such Questions as are far above us: for no one “ is above his Master.”

Upon the preceding Words of *Irenæus* † *Eras- mus* owns, that *Irenæus* seem’d to think that the Father only knew the Day of Judgment, and that

\* Irrationabiliter autem inflati audaciter inenarrabilia Dei mysteria scire vos dicitis: quandoquidem & Dominus, ipse Filius Dei, ipsum judicii diem & horam concessit scire solum Patrem; manifeste dicens, de die autem illa & hora nemo scit, neq; Filius, nisi Pater solus. Si igitur scientiam diei illius Filius non erubuit referre ad Patrem, sed dixit quod verum est; neq; nos erubescamus, quæ sunt in quæstionibus majora secundum nos, reservare Deo; nemo enim super magistrum est. *Iren. lib. 2. c. 28. edit. Massuet.*

† Videtur sentire quod solus Deus sciverit diem & horam, ignorante Filio. *Proleg. in Iren. p. 17.*

the Son did not know it : and our Learned Bishop Bull \* agrees with Erasmus, that the Words seem to ascribe Ignorance to the Son of God, even in his highest Capacity of being the Son of God. Irenæus, to put his Sense out of all Question, presently adds, “ † If any one enquires into the Reason, why the Father, who communicates in all Things to the Son, is yet by our Lord expressly declar’d to know ALONE that Day and Hour ; he will not at present find any fitter or more decent, or indeed any other safe Answer but this, that since our Lord is the only Teacher of Truth, we may learn from him, *that the Father is above all* ; for the Father, saith he, is Greater than I. The Father therefore is here declar’d by our Lord himself to be SUPERIOR in KNOWLEDGE also ; to the End that while we are in this World, we may learn to acknowledge God only to have perfect Knowledge, and leave such Questions to Him.” Dr. W. to shew how low he can descend in Reason and Argument, observes upon the Words of Irenæus, ‡ “ the Father (says he) communicates in all Things with the Son : and Consequently in all Knowledge, and particularly in that of the Day of Judgment,”

\* Fateor verba primo intuitu videri Filio Dei, etiam quæ maxime propriæ Dei Filius est, ignorantiam tribuere. Def. Fid. Nic. p. 82.

† Si quis exquirat causam, propter quam in omnibus Pater communicans Filio, solus scire horam & diem a Domino manifestatus est ; neq; aptabilem magis neq; decentiorem, nec sine periculo alteram quam hanc inveniet in præsentî (quoniam enim solus verax magister est Dominus) ut discamus per ipsum, *super omnia esse Patrem*: Etenim Pater, ait, *major me est*. Et secundum agnitionem itaq; præpositus esse Pater annunciatu est a Domino nostro ad hoc, ut & nos, in quantum in figura hujus mundi sumus, perfectam scientiam & tales quæstiones concedamus Deo. lib. 2. c. 28.

‡ First Defense, p. 105. 1<sup>st</sup> edit.



the Thing particularly *excepted* in this very Sentence. Antient Writers may be made to say any Thing at this rate of explaining them. Cou'd he alledge that *Irenæus*, or any other Antient, ever taught, that Christ knew what in the Text, and by *Irenæus* upon it, is declar'd to be known by the *Father only*; or that the Son was *Equal* in *Knowledge* to God the Father, it wou'd have been saying something.

2. *Origen*, tho' he allows that the Son knows the whole Will of God, yet denies that he is equally perfect in Knowledge with the Father. " \* The inquisitive Reader (says he) may ask, " whether the Father knows himself, as he is " known by the Son : and finding that it is writ- " ten, *the Father who sent me is greater than I*, he " will be perswaded that this is in all respects true, " so as to say that the Father is *greater* than the " Son even in Knowledge also, being more per- " fectly and clearly known by Himself, than by " the Son." Agreeably to this he elsewhere says upon the Words of the Apostle, *this is the true Light*, " † for the same Reason as God, the " Father of him who is *the Truth*, is a SUPERIOR " and GREATER Truth ; and the Father of him " who is *Wisdom*, is GREATER and more excel-

\* *Curiosus lector inquirat, utrum a semetipso cognoscatur Pater, quomodo cognoscitur a Filio : sciensq; illud quod scriptum est, Pater qui misit me major me est ; in omnibus verum esse contender, ut dicat & in COGNITIONE Filio Patrem esse MAJOREM, dum perfectius & purius a semetipso cognoscitur quam a Filio. lib. 4. de principiis apud Hieronym. in Epist. ad Avit. c. 4. atq; id esse causæ, quare Filium a Patre comprehendi, Patrem vero a Filio neutiquam comprehendi posse opinatus sit, ait Hieron. ibid.*

† Ω δὲ λόγῳ ὁ πατὴρ τῇ ἀληθείας θεὸς πλείων ἐστὶ καὶ μέζων ἀλήθεια, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὢν σοφίας κρείττων ἐστὶ καὶ διαφέρων ἢ σοφία, ὅτε τοῦ ὑπερέχει τοῦ εἶναι ὥς ἀληθινόν. *Com. in Joh. p. 70.*

" lent

“lent than *Wisdom*; for the same Reason he ex-  
 “cells him also who is the *true Light*.”

*Basil* himself understands the Text of the di-  
 vine Person of Christ, and that the *Knowledge* spoken  
 of in it belongs *primarily* to God the Father. His  
 Words are very remarkable.

“ \* That which I have been taught from a Child,  
 “ of those that went before me, is this—that as  
 “ we understand those Words, *there is none good*  
 “ *but one, that is God*, to be spoken by the Son,  
 “ not as excluding himself from being Partaker  
 “ of the Nature of Good, but only as supposing  
 “ the Father to be the FIRST Good, and by the  
 “ Word *none* meaning no other FIRST Good;  
 “ but that he himself is the *Second*—So in those  
 “ Words, *no one knoweth*, &c. we believe our  
 “ Lord meant to ascribe to the Father the FIRST  
 “ KNOWLEDGE of Things present and future,  
 “ and to declare to the World, that he is in all  
 “ Things the FIRST CAUSE, &c.”

And it is certain, as hath been shewn before,  
 that the moderate *Atbanasian* Writers never taught,  
 that the Son was *equal* to the Father in *absolute di-  
 vine Perfections*; but profess'd, that the Father,  
 as being alone *unoriginated*, and the *first Cause*, was  
 in all Things *supereminent* to the Son, who deriv'd  
 his Nature and all his Perfections from him; and  
 who always acted in Obedience to his supeme Au-  
 thority.

\* “Α πίνυν ἐκ παιδὸς ὡς πατέρων ἡκούσαμεν, — ταῦτα  
 εἰπὲν ἔχομεν. — ὡς τετηρήκαμεν ἐπὶ τῶ, εἰδὲς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἶς,  
 ὁ θεός, (εἰδὲς γὰρ ἐκεῖ ἐαυτὸν ἔξω πθεῖς τὸ τῶ ἀγαθῷ φύσεως ὁ υἱὸς  
 ταῦτα λέγει, ἀλλὰ, ἐπειδὴ τὸ πρῶτον ἀγαθὸν ὁ πατήρ, τῶ  
 εἰδὲς συνυπακομένῃς τῶ πρώτῃ, τὸ δεῦτερον εἰρηθεῖαι πιστεύομεν)  
 ἔτω καὶ τὸ, εἰδὲς οἶδε, τὴν πρώτην εἰδησιν ὡς τε ὄντων καὶ ὡς ἐσο-  
 μένων, ἐπὶ τῶ πατέρα ἀνάγον[το], καὶ διὰ πάντων τὴν πρώτην αἰ-  
 πῖαν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὑποδεικνύοντος, εἰρηθεῖαι νομίζομεν. Ad Am-  
 philech. Epist. 391.

The next Text to be consider'd is *Job. 14. 28.*  
*My Father is greater than I.* A Text, one would think, they should blush to read, who presume in Opposition to it to assert, that the Father is *not* greater than the Son; that the Son is absolutely co-ordinate and equal to the Father in *Nature* and all *essential Perfections*: and that the Father is so far from being, in any Respect, *greater* than the Son; that it was possible, that he himself *might have acted the ministerial Part*; and so that it might have been as well and truly written, that he who is in the Scripture call'd *Son* is *greater* than him who is call'd his *Father*.

The Socinian Interpretation of these Words, which the Scholastic Trinitarians also sometimes flee to for Refuge, *viz.* that God the Father is *greater* than a mere Man, or than the mere human Nature of Christ, is so low and mean that the old *Athanasians* themselves were ashamed of it.

Therefore Gregory Nazianzen says, “ \* To affirm that the Father is *greater* than Christ, consider'd merely as a Man, is true indeed, but no great Thing to say: for what wonder is it that God should be *greater* than a Man?” And it was the unanimous Doctrine of the antient Church that God the Father, as being alone *supreme over all*, was *superior* to, and *greater* than the Son, in *Nature* and all *divine Perfections*; in *Power*, *Authority*, *Dominion* and *Worship*.

Justin Martyr says, † “ He that is in Heaven is Lord even over him who is Lord upon Earth [speaking of Christ appearing before his Incarna-

\* Τὸ γὰρ δὴ λέγειν, ὅτι τῷ Χρῆστῳ τὸν ἄνθρωπον νοούμενῳ μείζων, ἀληθὲς μὲν, ἔ μέγα δὲ πῶς θαυμάσον, εἰ μείζων ἀνθρώπου θεός; Orat. 36.

† Ὃς [ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις ὑπάρχων] καὶ τῷ ὅπῃ γῆς κυεῖς κύριός ἐστιν, ὡς πατὴρ καὶ θεός, ἀπὸς τε αὐτοῦ τὸ εἶναι, καὶ δυνατὸς καὶ κυεῖν καὶ θεῶ. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 121.



“ tion on *Gen.* 19. 24.] being his *Father* and *God*,  
 “ and the Author of his Existence, even tho he  
 “ himself also be *powerful*, and *Lord*, and *God*.” And  
 he every where denys Christ, tho God, to be [*ὁ ποιη-  
 τὴς τῶν ὅλων*] the absolute or supreme Maker of the  
 Universe: but declares, that he is *subject* to him,  
 and *sent* by him.

And *Irenæus* from this Text infers (as hath been  
 just observ'd) that the Father is *above all*; and de-  
 clar'd by our Lord himself to be *superior* to him  
 the Son in *Knowledge*. Agreeably hereto he says  
 elsewhere, \* “ that our Lord himself taught his  
 “ Disciples, that the Father only is that *Lord* and  
 “ *God*, who is the *only God* and *Ruler over all*.”

*Tertullian* comparing the only-begotten Son to  
 the unbegotten Father says, † “ that which is  
 “ unoriginated is more *powerful* than that which is  
 “ originated——because that which had no Cause  
 “ of its Existence will always be much *superior* to  
 “ that, which had a Cause of its Existence.” Hence  
 he says in another Place; ‖ “ The Father is the  
 “ whole (divine) Substance, of which the Son is a  
 “ *derivative Part*; [like a *Ray* from the *Sun*, which  
 “ is his Comparison] he himself declaring, *My*  
 “ *Father is greater than I*.”

*Origen* says, as *Huetius* interprets his corrupted  
 Greek; “ It is a greater Thing that the Son of  
 “ Man is glorify'd by God, the *Inferior* by the  
 “ *Superior*, than that he who is *inferior* should have

\* Ipso Domino Patrem tantum Deum & Dominum eum qui  
*solus est Deus & Dominator omnium tradente discipulis, sequi*  
*nos oportet. Lib. 3. c. 9.*

† Innatum nato fortius; — quia quod ut esset, nullius  
 eguit auctoris, multo sublimius erit eo, quod ut esset, aliquem  
 habuit auctorem. *Cont. Hermog. c. 18.*

‖ Pater tota substantia est, Filius vero derivatio totius & por-  
 tio, sicut ipse profitetur quia Pater major me est. *Adv. Prax.*  
*c. 9.*

“ glorify'd

“ glorify’d him who is *greater* God, agreeably to  
 “ the Words, The Father who sent me is greater  
 “ than I \*.”

Again, “ the Father is *superior* to, and *greater*  
 “ than the Word.”

Again, “ we affirm, that the Son is *not more*  
 “ *powerful*, but that he is *less powerful* than the  
 “ Father ; according to his own Words, *the Fa-*  
 “ *ther who sent me is greater than I.*—We say  
 “ that our Saviour, whom we acknowledge to be  
 “ God the Word, beareth Rule over all Things  
 “ which are made subject to him ; but not over  
 “ his Father and God, who bears rule over  
 “ him.”

Again, “ we say that our Saviour, with the Holy  
 “ Ghost, not only comparatively, but superemi-  
 “ nently excels all the Things that were made  
 “ (By him) being yet himself *excell’d* by the Fa-  
 “ ther *as much, or even more* than he and the Holy  
 “ Ghost *excell* the other Creatures [viz. *Thrones,*  
 “ *Angels, &c.*] But notwithstanding he who *excels*  
 “ such and so great Beings in *Essence* and *Dignity*  
 “ and *Power* and *Godhead* [for he is the living

\* Majus est, quod Filius hominis glorificatus fuerit per Deum,  
 inferior per *præstantiorem*, quam quod inferior glorificaverit  
 Deum *præstantiorem* ; juxta illud : Pater qui misit me major me  
 est, Com. in Joh. p. 417. κρείττων καὶ μείζων [ὁ πατήρ] τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ  
 λόγον ibid. p. 56. φαμέν τὸ υἱὸν ἐκ ἰσχυρότερον τῷ πατρὶ αὐτῷ  
 ὑποτάσσον. καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον αὐτῷ πειθόμενοι εἰπόντι τὸ. ὁ πατήρ  
 ὁπότε με μείζων με ἐστὶ.—κεφαλεῖν—φαμέν τὸ σωτήρα μάλιστα.  
 ὅτε νοούμεν αὐτὸν θεὸν λόγον—πάντων μὲν ὧν ὑποταγμένων  
 αὐτῷ, καθὼ ταῦτά ἐστιν. ἀλλ’ ἔτι καὶ τῷ κεφαλεῖν αὐτὸν πατρὶ  
 καὶ θεῷ. Cont. Cels. lib. 8. p. 388. πάντων μὲν ὧν κνησίων ὑπερέχειν,  
 καὶ συγκρίσει ἀλλ’ ὑπερβαλλέσει ὑπερῆχῃ φαμέν τὸ σωτήρα καὶ τὸ  
 πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ΥΠΕΡΕΧΟΜΕΝΟΝ πᾶσιν ἢ καὶ πλεον ἀπὸ  
 τῷ πατρὶ, ὅσω ὑπερέχει αὐτὸς καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τῶν λοιπῶν,  
 ἡτῶν τυχόντων—ἀλλ’ ὅμως ὧν πᾶσιν καὶ τηλικέτων ὑπερέχων  
 ἡσυχία καὶ ἀρεσβεσία καὶ δυνάμει καὶ θεϊότητι (ἐμφυχος γὰρ ἐστὶ λόγος καὶ  
 σοφία) καὶ συγκρίνεται κατὰ τὸν πατέρα. Com. in Jo. p. 218.

Q

“ Word

“ *Word and Wisdom* ] is nevertheless not in any  
 “ *Thing compar'd to the Father.*”

*Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, and *Origen's* Scholar, \* taught not only a *Distinction of Person* (in the Father and the Son) but a *Difference of Substance*; and that the Son was inferior to the Father in *Power and Glory*.

† *Theognostus* another of *Origen's* Scholars taught the same Doctrine.

‡ *Novatian* says, that the Son as being *originated* is inferior to the Father.

And *Eusebius* || shews “ that the Word of God  
 “ who existed before the World, and is more  
 “ excellent than every Angelic Nature, is *less ex-*  
 “ *cellent than the first Cause.*”

And this Doctrine that the Father is *greater* than the Son, which was unanimously taught by the ancient *Antenicene* Church, was also profess'd by the *Nicenes* and *Postnicenes* likewise.

*Alexander* of *Alexandria* says, \*\* “ therefore we  
 “ must reserve to the unbegotten Father this pe-  
 “ culiar Preeminence, that no one is the Cause of  
 “ his Existence.”

The Council of *Syrmium* says, †† “ it is indis-  
 “ putable that the Father is greater than the Son  
 “ in *Honour, Dignity and Divinity*, the Son himself  
 “ declaring, *my Father is greater than I.*”

\* Cited above.

† See *Cave's Hist. Lit.* p. 98.

‡ Simul ut hic *minor* sit, dum in illo esse se scit, habeas originem, quia nascitur. *De Trinit.* c. 31.

|| “Εμ δ' ἂν ἔπος ὁ παρ' αἰώνων τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ, ὁ κρείττων μὲν ἢ πᾶσα ἀγγελικὴ φύσις, ΜΕΙΩΝ δὲ ἢ καὶ τὸ πρῶτον αἶψον. *Dem. Evang.* lib. 5. c. 11. vid. lib. 5. c. 30. & lib. 6. p. 257. proam.

\*\* Epist. apud *Socrat.* & *Theodoret.* cited above.

\* ΜΕΙΩΝΑ εἶναι τὸ πατέρα πμῶ καὶ ἀξία καὶ θεότητα. ap. *Socrat. Hist. Eccl.* lib. 2.

And



And *Basil* himself declares as much, \* “ the Son (says he) is *second* to the Father, in Order (of Nature) as being from him; and also in Dignity, because the Father is the Original and Cause of his Existence; and, because *thro’ him*, we have Access to God even the Father.” *Hilary’s* Opinion has been shewn above; and to put this Matter out of all Dispute, *Bishop Bull* himself has confess’d, † “ that *Origen’s* Doctrine, that the Son, even as he is God, is *less* than the Father, is plainly the Catholic Doctrine, maintain’d even by the Fathers, after the Council of Nice, who most strongly oppos’d the Arian Opinion.”

Another Text sufficient to silence the vain Pretences of modern Scholastic Orthodoxy that the only true God is the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, is *John* 17. 3. where our Saviour in his Prayer to his Father says, “ This is Life eternal, that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.” Parallel to this Text is that other of the same Apostle, 1 *John* 5. 20. “ And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an Understanding that we may know the true God [τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεόν, so the Original, according to the best and oldest MSS] and we are in him that is true [the true God] in [it shou’d be render’d, By] his Son Jesus Christ.

† Ὁ υἱὸς τάξει μὲν δεύτερος τῷ πατρὶ, ὅτι ἀπ’ ἐκείνου. καὶ ἀξιώματι, ὅτι ἀρχὴ καὶ αἰτία τῷ εἶναι αὐτοῦ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ ὅτι δι’ αὐτοῦ ὁ κόσμος καὶ ὁ σωσμός. *Advers. Eunom.* lib. 3. p. 79.

† Quod *origenes* in loco citato dicit, Filium etiam qua Deus est—Patre minorem esse;—plane catholicum esse, atque etiam a Patribus, qui post Nicænum concilium Arianam hæresin acerrime impugnârunt, defensum—ostendemus. *Def. F. N.* § 2. c. 9. See Not. apud *Novat. edit.* Jackson, p. 365. 366. and 387—391. and Reply to Dr. *Waterland’s* Defense, 2d. 1, 2.

“ This is the true God [mention'd in the former  
 “ Part of the Verse, and to the Knowledge of  
 “ whom Christ came to bring us, and in whom we  
 “ are By him] and eternal Life.”

In those two Texts it is so evident that God the Father, in Contradistinction to the Son, is stil'd *the only true God*, that not only the antient *Antenice* Church ever taught and profess'd that the Father alone was *the one and only true God*; and that Christ, as being *sent* by him, was *inferior* and *subject* to him: but even the *Nicenes* and *Postnicenes* themselves understood these Texts of God the Father; and both acknowledg'd the Father in Distinction to the Son to be *the only true God*; and never stil'd the Son so, but, on the contrary, confess'd that his *Mission* from the Father declar'd his *Subordination* and *Subjection* to him.

*Iræneus* says, “ \* our Lord himself taught his  
 “ Disciples that the *Father only* is that Lord and  
 “ God, who is the *only God* and Ruler over all.”

From *John* 17. 3. † *Origen* infers, that the Father only is *absolutely God* [ὁ θεός] as being [αὐτόθεος] of himself God, or *unoriginated*. And says, “ that the  
 “ Father, who *sent* the Son, is alone both [absolutely]  
 “ good, and *greater* than him who is sent.”

On Account that the Father is the only true God and sent the Son, *Theophilus* the antient Bishop of, *Antioch* says, ‡ “ that the Word being  
 “ God, and begotten of God, the Father of the

\* *Ipso Domino Patrem tantum Deum & Dominum eum, qui solus est Deus & dominator omnium, tradente discipulis, lib. 3. c. 9.*

† *Com. in Joh. p. 46. Ὁ γὰρ πέμψας αὐτὸν πατὴρ —*  
 ἔτ' ὁ καὶ μόνος ἀγαθὸς καὶ μέγας τῷ πεμφθέντι. *ibid. p. 130.*

‡ Θεὸς ἐν ᾧ ὁ λόγος καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ πεφυκώς, ὅποτι αὐτὸς βέβαιον ἔστι πατὴρ τῶν ὅλων, πέμπει αὐτὸν εἰς τινὰ τόπον. *ad Autolyc. τὸν μὲν θεὸν τῶν ὅλων ἀσεβὲς ἀγγέλον νομίσαι καλεῖσθαι. Synod. Antioch, ad. Paul. Samosat.*

“ Uni-

“ Universe *sends* him to any Place, whenever he “ *wills* so to do.” But to suppose the Father, *the* “ God of the Universe, to be an Angel or to be “ sent, was esteemed the greatest Impiety.”

In like Manner *Novatian* observes, “ moreover “ he (our Lord) declares that he was *sent*; that by “ this Instance of Obedience which Christ the Lord “ shewed in coming when he was sent, he might “ be prov’d to be not the *Father*, but the *Son*: “ who would certainly have been the *Sender*, had “ he been the *Father*: but the Father was not *sent*, “ left by being *sent*, he should thereby be found “ *subject* to another God\*.”

*Eusebius* says, that Christ was † “ *sent* by one “ who is Greater than He. And that the *Pree-* “ *minence* of the Father’s Glory is shewn, in *send-* “ *ing* the Son, and the Son’s being *Sent*.”

‡ “ In this respect especially (says *Hilary*) the “ Son is not *compar’d* or *equal* to the Father, in “ that he is by an absolute Obedience *subject* to “ him——that he is *sent*; that he *receives* all from “ him; and that in all Things he *obeys* the *Will* “ of him that *Sent* him:——hence there is but *one* “ God; and both the *Subjection* and *Dignity* of the “ Son is declar’d to us——He being by *Obedience*, “ as well as in *Name*, subject to the Father.”

\* *Missum* autem præterea se esse dicit, ut per hanc obedi-  
tiam qua venit Dominus Christus missus, non Pater, sed Filius  
probetur; qui misisset utiq; si Pater fuisset: *missus* autem non  
fuit Pater, ne Pater *subditus* alteri Deo, dum *mittitur*, probare-  
tur, c. 27. edit. *Jackson*. absit Deum Patrem *Angelum* dicere,  
ne alteri *subditus* sit, cujus *Angelus* fuerit. c. 18. so plainly in  
the Sense of the Antients, did the *Mission* of Christ the Son of  
God imply his *Obedience* and *Subjection* to the supreme Authority  
of the Father.

† Πρὸς τὸ ΜΕΙΖΟΝΟΣ ἀπεσπλάνον. *Præp. Evang.* lib. 7.  
c. 12. ὑπερέχον τῆς δόξης τῆ πατρὸς παείησι διὰ τὸ ἢ ἀπε-  
σπλάναι, ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἀπεσπλάναι. *Eccles. Theolog.* lib. 2. c. 7.

‡ P. 234. cited above.

And





“ He whom we preach and worship is the  
 “ ONLY TRUE GOD, the Lord of the Crea-  
 “ tion, and the Author of every Being ; and who  
 “ else is this Person, but the most holy Father  
 “ of Christ, and who is far above all deriv’d Be-  
 “ ings ?

I shall conclude the Sense of the Antients in  
 their Application of the preceeding Texts *John*  
*17. 3.* *1 John 5. 20.* to God the Father, to prove  
 from thence, that the Title of *the only true God*,  
 and *the true God*, peculiarly belong’d to him only,  
 with a remarkable Passage of an unsuspected Au-  
 thor, viz. *Epiphanius*, whereby it appears that in  
 his Time, the Titles of *the only true God*, and *the*  
*true God* mention’d in these Texts, were univer-  
 sally understood to be ascrib’d to the Father only.

\* “ The Son Himself saith concerning the Fa-  
 “ ther, *that they may know Thee, the only true God.*  
 “ But that faithful Witnesses *who lean’d upon his*  
 “ *Breast*, and call’d him the only-begotten God,  
 “ did not give him the Title of *true God* : but the  
 “ Father is declar’d by him to be *the true God*,  
 “ and the Son the *only-begotten God*. Again, it is  
 “ written of the Father, *God is Light* ; but of the  
 “ Son, that he was *the true Light*. And here ob-  
 “ serve the Accuracy of Scripture——it is written

\* Περὶ τῆ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ὁ υἱὸς λέγει· ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε τὸν  
 μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν. ἀξιόπιστος δὲ μάρτυς ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ σῆθι αὐτοῦ  
 ἀναπεσὼν, μονογενὴ θεὸν αὐτὸν φασκων· ἔπεσθετο δὲ τῷ μο-  
 νογενεῖ θεῷ τὸ, ΘΕΟΣ ΑΛΗΘΙΝΟΣ. ἀλλὰ περὶ πατρὸς γέ-  
 γραπται, ΑΛΗΘΙΝΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ· περὶ υἱοῦ, δέ, ὅτι μονογενὴς  
 θεός. τὸ δὲ πάλιν περὶ πατρὸς, ὅτι φῶς ὁ θεός· περὶ δὲ υἱοῦ, ὅτι  
 ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν. καὶ ὅρα μοι τὴν σὴν γραφὴν ἀκρί-  
 βειαν——ὅτι τῷ υἱῷ γέγραπται, ὅτι θεός ὁ υἱός. καὶ καὶ ἐπὶ  
 σκεπται τὸ, θεός ΑΛΗΘΙΝΟΣ, μανίαν ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισηρεύμεν, εἰ  
 τοιμήσωμεν βλασφημεῖν καὶ μὴ εἰπεῖν ὅτι υἱὸν θεὸν ΑΛΗΘΙΝΟΝ.  
 —τὸ μὲν παρὶ τὸ, ΘΕΟΣ ΑΛΗΘΙΝΟΣ, τῷ δὲ υἱῷ τὸ,  
 θεός. ἀνάπαλιν δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τὸ, φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, τῷ δὲ πατρί τὸ,  
 φῶς, *Ancorat. Sect. 3, 4. vid Hæres 69. Sect. 32. & 76. c. 36.*  
*Sect. 2.*

“ of

“ of the Son, that he is (*θεός*) *God*, and tho’ the  
 “ Title of *the true God* is not there ascrib’d to  
 “ him, we shou’d be mad to deny that the Son is  
 “ *true God*.—The Father therefore is in Scripture  
 “ stil’d *the true God*, but the Son barely *God*; on  
 “ the other Hand the Son is stil’d *the true Light*,  
 “ but the Father barely *Light*.” Thus this *Athanasian*  
*Writer* confesses, that the Son is never call’d  
*the true God* in the Scriptures, even whilst by Way  
 of Inference he endeavours to prove in Contradiction  
 to them, that the Son is *the true God*. Dr. W.  
 every where asserts and insists, that Christ is to be  
 pray’d to and worship’d as *the supreme God*, in plain  
 and direct Contradiction to the following Texts of  
 Scripture, and the unanimous Sense of the antient  
 Church.

*Luke* 11. 2. Our Saviour teaches his Disciples  
 how to pray, in these Words; “ when ye pray,  
 “ say, *our Father* which art in Heaven, &c.”

Again, “ In that Day ye shall ask me nothing:  
 “ verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye  
 “ shall ask *the Father* in my Name, He will give it  
 “ you. *John* 16. 23.

“ There is *one God*, and *one Mediator* between  
 “ God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus. *1 Tim.*  
 “ 2. 5.

These, amongst other numerous Places of Scripture,  
 instruct us in the Object of Christian Worship: and teach us that God, the Father of our  
 Lord Jesus Christ, is the alone supreme and ultimate  
 Object of our Adoration and Prayer. The  
 Scriptures never direct us to pray to Christ or the  
 Holy Ghost; but the Command of Christ, and  
 the Practice of his Apostles, which is our best and  
 only Rule, concur in the offering up all Prayer  
 and religious Worship to the only true God, the  
 Father, *in the Name* of Christ, who is the only  
 true Mediator, between God and Men: And what-

ever



ever religious Honour or Worship is in Scripture given to the Son, it is never founded on his divine Nature or Essence, or on his *Original* and *supreme* Authority and *Dominion*, (on which the Worship of God the Father is founded) but on his *becoming* Man, on his being *appointed* to be *Mediator*; on the Father's having *committed* all Judgment to him, *Job*. 5. 22, 27. It is also given him by the *Command* of the Father (*Heb.* 1. 6.) and is not *supreme* or *ultimate*, but tends *finally* to the *Glory* of God the Father, *Phil.* 2. 11. The Worship therefore of Christ is *mediate*, *relative* and *subordinate*; and they who worship Christ otherwise than the Scripture directs him to be worship'd, pretending to be wise above what is written, do, with the foolish *Samaritans*, *worship they know not what*, *John* 4. 22. whereas the true *Worshippers* of God, as our Lord adds, v. 23. *worship the Father in Spirit and Truth*, in the Name, and through the *Mediation* of Jesus Christ his Son our Lord.

This was the concurrent Doctrine of the antient Church. The antient Book entitled the *Apostolical Constitutions*, informs us of the primitive Method of religious Worship.

\* “ We declare unto you (say they) that there is  
“ only one God Almighty, besides whom there  
“ is no other; and that you must worship and  
“ adore him alone, *through* Jesus Christ our Lord,  
“ in the most holy Spirit.”

*Polycarp* the Apostolical Bishop of *Smyrna* at his Martyrdom pray'd thus; † “ for this Cause a-  
R “bove

\* Δηλώμεν ὑμῖν θεὸν παντὶ κράτος ἓνα μόνον ὑπάρχον, παρ' οὗ ἄλλος ἕκ ἐστιν καὶ αὐτὸν μόνον σέβειν καὶ προσκυνεῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, ἐν τῷ παναγίῳ πνεύματι. *lib.* 6. c. 14. *vid. lib.* 2. c. 56. *lib.* 5. c. 15. *lib.* 6. c. 9. *lib.* 7. c. 37, 38, 43.

† Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ περὶ πάντων σὲ αἰνῶ, σὲ εὐλογῶ, σὲ δοξάζω, διὰ τοῦ αἰωνίου ἀρχιερέως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ σου παιδός.

“bove all Things I praise Thee, I blefs Thee,  
 “I glorify Thee, thro’ the eternal high Priest  
 “Jesus Christ, thy beloved Son: through whom,  
 “and with whom, in the holy Spirit, be Glory  
 “to Thee now and for ever and ever. Amen.”

*Justin Martyr* says ; \* “there are no Nations  
 “upon Earth, in which Prayers and Thankf-  
 “givings are not put up to the Father and Ma-  
 “ker of all Things, through the Name of Je-  
 “sus who was crucify’d.” Again ; “The Mi-  
 “nister taking [the Bread and Cup] gives Praise  
 “and Glory to the Father of all, thro’ the Name  
 “of the Son, and thro’ the Holy Ghost.” And  
 this he tells us was the Rule in all religious Ob-  
 lations at the Lord’s Supper.

This primitive Martyr tells us farther, † that  
*next after the unbegotten God*, they also worship’d  
 the Son by his *Command*, in the *second Place*, or  
 in subordination to Him.

*Melito* the antient Bishop of *Sardis*, delivers the  
 Christian Doctrine in these Words ; ‡ “we do not  
 “worship Beings that have no sense, but the on-  
 “ly God who is *before all* and *above all*, even  
 “above Christ himself who is truly God the  
 “Word.”

παιδὸς δὲ ἔσσι σὺν αὐτῷ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ δόξα, νῦν καὶ  
 εἰς τὰς μέλλοντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. *Αμὲν. apud Euseb. Hist.*  
*Eccles. lib. 4. c. 15.*

\* Ἐν οἷς μὴ διὰ τῆς ὀνόματος τῆς σαυρωθέντις Ἰησοῦ εὐχαὶ καὶ  
 εὐχαριστίαι τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ποιητῇ τῶν ὅλων γίνονται. *Dial. p.*  
*112. ἔπε λαβὼν αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων διὰ τῆς*  
*ὀνόματος τῆς ἡμετέρας καὶ τῆς πνεύματος τῆς ἁγίας ἀναπέμπει. Apol. 2.*  
*p. 161. vid. p. 162.*

† *Apol. 1. p. 24. edit. Grab. Apol. 2. p. 34, 35. Dial. p. 97.*  
*edit. Steph*

‡ Οὐκ ἐσμὲν ἑδεμίαν αἰσθησὶν ἐχόντων θεραπευταὶ ἀλλὰ  
 μόνος θεὸς τῶν πάντων καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων, καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ Χριστῷ αὐ-  
 τῷ ὄντως θεῷ λόγῳ. *Apud Chron. Alex. ad Olymp. 236. 2. p.*  
*607.*

And *Irenæus* has this most solemn Prayer ; \*  
 “ I call upon Thee, O Lord, the God of Abra-  
 “ ham, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ ;  
 “ who art the *only and true God*, above whom  
 “ there is no other God : through our Lord Je-  
 “ sus Christ.”

“ † If thou wilt (says *Clemens Alexandrinus*) be  
 “ thou initiated ; and thou shalt be in the Chorus  
 “ with Angels praising the unbegotten and incor-  
 “ ruptible and only true God : *God the Word* joining  
 “ with us in our Hymns of Praise. This Jesus,  
 “ the one eternal great High Priest of *the one*  
 “ *God who is the Father*, prays for Men.”

The next antient Writer is the most learned  
*Origen*, who gives us the fullest and clearest Ac-  
 count of the Distinction of the Worship of the  
 Father and the Son. “ ‡ We ought (says he) to  
 “ send up all Supplication, and Prayer, and Inter-  
 “ cession, and Thanksgiving, to *the supreme God*  
 “ *over all, through* our High Priest, the living  
 “ *Word and God*, who is above all Angels : yet  
 “ we may also offer Supplications, and Intercef-  
 “ sions, and Thanksgiving, and Prayer, to the  
 “ Word Himself, if we can distinguish between

\* Ego igitur invoco te, Domine Deus Abraham—  
 Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi : ——— qui es solus & ve-  
 nus Deus, super quem alius Deus non est, per Dominum no-  
 strum Jesum Christum, &c. *adv. Hæres. lib. 3. c. 6.* And he  
 puts the Worship due unto the Son of God upon the [εὐδοκί-  
 α] Good pleasure of the Father. *Lib. 1. c. 10.*

† Εἰ βέλαι, καὶ σὺ μὲν, καὶ χρεύσεις μετ' ἀγγέλων ἀμφὶ  
 ἀγένητον καὶ ἀνώλεθρον καὶ μόνον ὄντως θεὸν συνημένους  
 μὲν τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ· αἰdios ἔτος Ἰησὺς εἰς ὃ μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς  
 καὶ τὸ ἐνδὸς τῷ αὐτῷ καὶ πατρὶς ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων εὐχεται. *Exhor.*  
 74, 75.

‡ Πᾶσαν μὲν γὰρ δέησιν, καὶ προσευχὴν, καὶ ἐντευξιν, καὶ εὐ-  
 χεσίαν, ἀναπεμπτέον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ, διὰ τῆς ἐπὶ πάντων  
 ἀγγέλων ἀρχιερείας, ἐμψύχῃ λόγῳ καὶ βεῶ· δεησόμεθα δὲ καὶ  
 ὑπὲρ τῶν λόγων, καὶ ἐντευξόμεθα αὐτῷ, καὶ εὐχαριστήσομεν, καὶ  
 προσευξόμεθα δὲ, ἐὰν δυνάμεθα κατακτείνῃς τῆς περὶ προσευχῆς  
 μελεξίας καὶ καταχρήσεως. *Adv. Cels. lib. 5. p. 233.*



“ Prayer in a *proper*, and Prayer in a *figurative* Sense.” And what he means by this Distinction of Prayer in a *proper* Sense, when offer’d to God the Father, and Prayer in an *improper* or *figurative* Sense, when offer’d to Christ, he thus explains in another Place ; \* “ we worship (says he) the one God, and his one Son, and Word, and Image, with Supplications, and Prayers to the utmost of our Power : putting up our Prayers to the God of the Universe, *through* his only-begotten Son : to whom we offer them first, desiring Him as being the Propitiation for our Sins, to present as our high Priest, our Prayers and Sacrifices [Thanksgivings] and Intercessions to the *supreme God*.”

Again, in his Book *concerning Prayer*, he very fully and distinctly shews the Rule of worship practis’d by the antient Church. “ † If we understand (says he) what *Prayer* is, (meaning *ultimate* in contradistinction to *mediatorial*) we must not pray to any *deriv’d* Being, no not to Christ himself, *but only to the God and Father of the Universe* : to whom also our Saviour Himself pray’d (as I have shewn before) and teacheth us to pray unto him. For being ask’d (by one of his Disciples) *viz. teach us to pray* ; he doth not teach us to pray to *Himself*, but to the *Father* ; and that we shou’d say, *our Father who art in Heaven*.” Again, “ we ought (says he) to pray to *God only, the Father of all* ; but not

\* Αλλὰ τὸν ἕνα Θεὸν, καὶ τὸν ἕνα υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ λόγον, καὶ εἰκόνα, ταῖς κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν ἡμῶν ἱκεσίαις καὶ ἀξιώσεσι σέβουσαι περσάροντες τῷ θεῷ τῶν ὅλων τὰς εὐχὰς διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς αὐτοῦ ὃ πρῶτον προσφέρουμεν αὐτῷ, ἀξιῶντες αὐτὸν, ἱλασθῆναι ὅντα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, προσαγαγῆναι ὡς ἀρχιερεῖα καὶ εὐχαρίαι καὶ τὰς θυσίας, καὶ τὰς ἐντεύξεις ἡμῶν τῷ ἐπὶ πάνσι θεῷ. *Ad Col. lib. 8. p. 386. see p. 384.*

† *De Orat. p. 50, 51, 52, 53. edit Weistien.*

“ without our High-Priest.——Therefore the  
 “ Saints in their Eucharistical Prayers, give Thanks  
 “ to God through Jesus Christ. And as he that  
 “ prays in the strict and proper Sense, ought not  
 “ to pray to him (primarily and ultimately) who  
 “ himself prays ; but to the Father, whom our  
 “ Lord Jesus taught us to invoke in our Pray-  
 “ ers ; so ought no Prayer to be offer'd to the  
 “ Father without Him, *John* 16. 23, 24.” Whence  
 he concludes that we ought always to pray to  
 the Father *in his Name*. And as our Prayers ought  
 to be offer'd up to God the Father *through Christ* ;  
 so he observes farther, that the \* *Doxology* in the  
 End of our Prayers, ought likewise to be offer'd  
 to God *through Christ*, and *in the Holy Ghost*.

Lastly, *Eusebius* says ; † “ the only-begotten  
 “ of God and first-born of the Universe, the Be-  
 “ ginning of all Things commands us to esteem  
 “ his Father the *only true God*, and to worship  
 “ him alone.”

From the preceding Passages, to which many  
 more might be added, on the Point of Worship,  
 it is as evident and demonstrable as a Matter can  
 be, that as the antient Church always profess'd it  
 as the Scripture-doctrine, that God the Father only  
 was *the only true God*, and the supreme Maker  
 of the Universe ; so likewise it taught that he on-  
 ly ought to be invocated and worship'd, in the  
*bighest, strict and proper* Sense of Prayer and Wor-  
 ship ; i. e. as the *Original, primary and ultimate* Ob-  
 ject of all religious Adoration : that as the Holy  
 Ghost was never stil'd *God or Lord*, so he was ne-  
 ver invocated in Prayer at all : and that, as the

\* p. 145, 146.

† Αυτὸς ὁ μονογενὴς τῷ θεῷ καὶ πρωτότοκος τῶν ὄλων ἢ πάντων ὄντων· τὸν αὐτὸν πατέρα μόνον ἡγεῖσθαι θεὸν ἀληθινόν, καὶ μόνον σεβειν ἡμῖν παρακαλεῖται. *Præp. Evang. lib. 7. p. 327.*

Son was *inferior* to the Father, and always subject unto him, and was constituted by him to be our *High-Priest, Saviour, Advocate, and Judge* : so the Father was worship'd and pray'd to *Through him*, and *in his Name* ; and He himself was invocated in a *mediate* and *subordinate* Sense, that he might (as our Mediator) offer up, and by his Mediation render effectual our Prayers *to the one God and Father of all*. But it never was the Doctrine or Practice of the antient Church to worship Christ as being *the supreme God*, or the *same God* with the Father ; as Dr. W. pretends, and most grossly misrepresents it, and abuses his Readers in so doing.

Two Texts more remain to be consider'd in order to conclude this Treatise. *Prov. 8. 22.* " The Lord possess'd [*ἐκτίσθαι* Gr. *created*] me in " the Beginning of his Way, before his Works of " old." Parallel to this is *Coloss. 1. 15.* " who is " the Image of the invisible God, the *first-born* of " every Creature." In the first Text *Wisdom* there spoken of was understood by the Antients, to be meant of Christ the Son of God, who is also in the new Testament call'd the *Wisdom of God*, *1 Cor. 1. 24.* And the Antients also understood the Text, as render'd by the Greek Interpreters, *viz.* that Christ or *Wisdom* was *created* by God : the Antient Jews likewise, as appears from the *Chaldee Paraphrase* understood the Word render'd *possess'd*, to signify *created*, as the Greek version of the Seventy, and the old *Syriac* version have it ; and as the \* Word signifies elsewhere. So that they who alledge that the Word signifies, *possess'd*, as distinct from being *created*, shew plainly that they have an Hypo-

\* The Hebrew Word is *Kanah* which the Greek translates again *created*, *Gen. 14. 19.* and *Maimonides* likewise on *Gen. 14. 22.* the *Chaldee Paraphrase* renders it by *Bara*, which signifies *created* ; so that it is very weak to suppose that instead of [*ἐκτίσθαι*] *created*, the right rendering shou'd be [*ἐκτισθαι*] *possess'd*.



thesis to serve, and want a Pretense to support it.

Upon the other Text, *Coloss. i. 15.* \* *Isidore of Pelusium*, a zealous *Athanasian* owns that the Word [*πρωτότοκος*] *first-born*, signifies the same as [*πρωτόκτιστος*] *first-created*. And therefore contends that the Word ought to be read by a change of Accent [*πρωτοτόκος*] to signify that Christ is not the *first-born*, but the *first* or *Prime-Creator*: making the Apostle's sense plainly absurd.

But the Antients understood the two preceding Texts in their plain and obvious Sense to teach that Christ, the *Word* and *Wisdom* of God, was *created*; and never scrupled to affirm and profess that he was a *Creature*: not meaning that he was one of, or like one of the inferior Creatures which God made By Him; but that he was (in an inef-  
fable Manner) the immediate *Creation* and *offspring* of God; *deriv'd* (without any secondary Cause) by the *Power* and *Will* of the one supreme God and Father of all.

Thus the antient *Apostolical* † *Constitutions* stile the Son, that *Wisdom which God created*.

‡ *Melito* wrote a Treatise, concerning the *Creation of Christ*.

\*\* *Tertullian* comparing the only-begotten *Word* (the Son) with the Father, says; “ that the Fa-  
“ ther is *prior* to him; and as being unoriginated  
“ is more *powerful* than He who is originated;

\* *Lib. 3. Epist. 31.*

† Ὅπως εἰς μῆμιν ἐρχόμεθα τῆς ὑπὸ σὺ κτισθείσης σοφί-  
as. *Lib. 7. c. 36.*

‡ Περὶ κτίσεως Χριστοῦ. *Cav. in vit. Melito. p. 183. & Hist. Lit. p. 43.*

\*\* Quale est ut Filio Dei sermone unigenito & primogenito aliquid fuerit præter Patrem *Antiquius*, & hoc modo utique *generosius*; nedum quod innatum nato fortius, & quod infec-  
tum facto validius, &c. *Adv. Hermog. c. 18. see adv. Prax.*

and

“ and being *unmade* is mightier than he who is “ *made.*” And yet he thought Christ, as he thought *humane Souls*, to be produc’d or created from the *Substance of God.*

\* *Clemens Alexandrinus* alluding to the Text of *Proverbs* before-cited, calls Christ, *the Wisdom which God first-created.* And *Photius* and *Jerom* charge him with making the Son a *Creature.*

*Origen*, whose Orthodoxy *Dr. W.* makes no Question of, is known to have made the Son and Spirit *Creatures.*

Of this, † *Epiphanius*, *Jerom*, *Justinian* and *Photius* are ample and unexceptionable Witnesses.

‡ *Dionysius of Alexandria*, \*\* *Gregory of Nicaea*, and †† *Theognostus of Alexandria*, all of them

\* Σοφίας τῆς πρωτοκτίστῃ τῷ θεῷ. *Strom.* p. 591. τὸν υἱὸν εἰς κτίσμα διάγει. de *Clem. Phot. Cod.* 109. *Clementem* quoque virum catholicum scribit in libris suis interdum Dei Filium dicere creaturam. *Apol.* 2. adv. *Ruffin.*

† Φανερώματα τὸν υἱὸν τῷ θεῷ κτίσμα ἐδογματίσθη καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον κτιστὸν εἰσηγήσατο. *Epiph. Hares.* 64. § 5. vid. et 8. Christum Filium Dei non *natum* esse sed *factum*—Deum Patrem esse lumen incomprehensibile, Christum collatione Patris, splendorem esse *perparvum*—tertium dignitate & honore post Patrem & Filium asserit Spiritum Sanctum: de quo, cum ignorare se dicat utrum *factus* sit an *infectus*; in posterioribus, quid de eo sentiret, expressit; nihil absque solo Deo Patre, *infectum* esse confirmans. *Hieron. Epist. ad Avit.* vid. *Apol.* 2. adv. *Ruffin.* See Reply to *Dr. W’s Defense*, Qu. 12. ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα κτίσματα εἰσι. *Justin. Epist. ad Menam* Τὸν μὲν υἱὸν ὑπὸ τῷ πατρὶ πτωίνδαι, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ὑπὸ τῷ υἱῷ. *Phot. Cod.* 58.

‡ Nihil creatum aut serviens in Trinitate credamus, ut vult *Dionysius* fons *Arii.* *Gennad. lib. de Eccles. Dogmat.* c. 4. vid. & *Basil. Epist.* 41. & *Dionysium Alexandrinum* urbis Episcopum, virum eruditissimum contra *Sabellium* disputantem, in *Arianum* dogma delabi. *Hieron. Apol.* 2. adv. *Ruffin.*

\*\* Πολλὰς ἀν εὐρεῖς ἐκεί φωνὰς τὰς νῦν τοῖς αἰρετικοῖς μερίσιν ἰχρὺν παρεχόμενας, ὡς τὸ κτίσμα καὶ τὸ πώϊσμα, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς τούτοις. *Basil. de Greg. Thaumai. Epist.* 64.

†† Κτίσμα αὐτὸν [Χριστὸν] ἀποφαίνει. *Phot. de Theognost.* *Cod.* 106. *Origenis* nimium sequax errores immiscuit pessimos; inter

them Scholars and Followers of the great *Origen*, taught with him, that the *Son* and *Spirit* were *Creatures* of the *Father*.

\* *Pierius* another most eminent Scholar of *Origen* taught the same Doctrine. And the Learned *Eusebius* of *Cæsarea* calls the *Son*, † “ the perfect *Creature* of the perfect *God*.” And also; “ the substantial *Wisdom* created [*Prov.* 8. 22.] of *God* before all *Ages*.” And declares the *Holy Spirit* “ to be one of those *Beings* which were made by the *Son*; and affirms this to be the *Doctrine* of the holy *Catholic Church* deliver’d in the *Scriptures*.” And to this agrees the *Letter* of the *Presbyters* and *Deacons* of the *Church* of *Alexandria*, which they wrote upon *Occasion* of the *Arian* Controversy just then broke out, to *Alexander* their *Bishop*; in which *Letter* they tell him ‡ “ that the *Faith* which they had receiv’d from their *Forefathers*, and had been taught by him also, was this. We confess one unbegotten, only eternal, only true *God* — that this *God* begat his only-begotten *Son* before the

inter S. S. Trinitatis personas totidem dignitatis gradus effingens; Christumque pariter ac Spiritum S. ad creaturarum sortem detru- dens. *Cav. Hist. liter.* p. 98.

\* Περὶ μὲν τοι τῷ πνεύματος ἐπισημαῖος λίαν καὶ δυσσε- βῶς δογματίζει· ὑποβεβηκέναι γὰρ αὐτὸ τῆς τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ ἀποφάσκει δόξης. *De Pierio. Phot Cod.* 119.

† Τέλειον τελεία δημιούργημα. *Demonst. Evang. lib.* 4. c. 2. Σοφίας ἐσωδὼς ὑφεσώσης, καὶ πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων ὑπὸ τῷ θεῷ κτισθείσης. *Eclog. Prophet. apud Cav. Hist. liter. part.* 2. p. 65. Τὸ δὲ παρόκλητον πνεῦμα, ἢ θεός, ἢ υἱός — ἐν δὲ τῇ τῶν διὰ υἱῷ γνομένων. — ταῦτα μὲν ἐν τῇς καθολι- κῆς καὶ ἀγίας ἐκκλησίας ὧς δε πη διὰ τῶν θείων φωνῶν παρὰ δίδεται τὰ μυστήρια. *De Eccles. Theol. lib.* 3. c. 6. *vid.* & *cont. Marcel. lib.* 1. c. 4.

‡ Ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν ἢ ἐκ προγόνων, ἢν καὶ ἀπὸ σε μεμαθήκαμεν — μόνον αἰδιον — μόνον ἀληθινόν. — ὑποστήσονται ἰδίῳ θελήματι ἄλ- λητον καὶ ἀναλλοιώτον κλίσμα τῷ θεῷ τέλειον. *Apud Atha- nas. De synod. Arim. & Seleuc. & Epirhan. Heres.* 69.



“ Ages of the World—that by his own *Will*  
 “ he gave him Subsistence, who is the *immutable*  
 “ and *unchangeable* perfect *Creature* of God, &c.”  
 The whole Letter is highly worthy of the Learned Reader’s careful Perusal ; and contains the undoubted Catholic Doctrine of the antient Church.

The Inference which I shall draw from the foregoing Sense of Antiquity concerning their Doctrine, that the *Son* and *Spirit* were *created* and *Creatures*, is this ; that as on the one Hand it is absurd, to suppose that the antient Fathers ever thought the *Son* and *Spirit* to be the *supreme God*, *the same God* with the Father, or *equal* to him in any Respect ; so they, who out of extraordinary Piety, do sometimes magnify our blessed Saviour with great Sublimities of Expression, and never refuse him any Title which the Scripture ascribes to him, wou’d not, in declaring his *Subordination* to God the Father, diminish him by using Expressions in any Degree *lower* than what they thought were warranted by *Scripture*, and necessary to secure the Peerless supreme Majesty and Honour of the ONE GOD and Father of All.

## CONCLUSION.

I HAVE laid before the Christian Reader, with the utmost Sincerity and Care, the unanimous Sense of the antient Church, relating to some principal Texts of Scripture on which the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity is founded ; and have shewn from thence, that what Dr. *Waterland* calls and insists to impose as the Doctrine of the Trinity, is not the *Scripture-doctrine*, or that of the *antient Church* at all : but is a merely fictitious Doctrine, directly repugnant to the catholic Doctrine of the *Antenicene* and even *Nicene Church* ; and

and was propagated chiefly after the Council of Nice, in the latter End of the fourth Century (when great Corruptions were crept into the Church) by the superstitious Worshippers of *Relicks* and *Saints*; and supported by Ecclesiastical Tyranny: but it is as really opposite to *Scripture*, *Reason*, and the universal Sense of the primitive Church, as *Darkness* is to *Light*; and as *Tritheism* is to the fundamental Article of all true Religion, the *Unity* of God.

The *Scripture-doctrine* of the Trinity, on which the right Knowledge of the Christian Œconomy and Dispensation depends, has been in all Ages from the Beginning corrupted by false and deceitful Teachers; who in order to depress and diminish the Excellency of the Christian Revelation have taught, either that Christ the Son of God was a mere Man (according to the *Jewish* and *Socinian* Notion) or [according to the *Sabellian*—and—*Gnostic* Doctrine] that he was *the same God with the one God and Father of all*: both by contrary extremes, agreeing in taking away his true and proper Divinity as being the only-begotten Son of God.

The Doctrine of *Tritheism* and *Polytheism* amongst the rest of the old Heresies, dar'd to shew its Head in the first Ages of the Church; and it was one Branch of the *Gnostic* Impiety, amongst the *Valentinians*, as *Sabellianism* was another; and also the known *Marcionite* \* Doctrine.

The forty first Apostolical Canon points at some who baptiz'd † into three unoriginated Persons. And the ‡ Apostolical Constitutions assure us,

\* See *Tertul. adv. Marcion. lib. 1. & Athanasius de Synod. Arim. & Seleuc. p. 929. edit. Paris. 1627.*

† ΕΙΣ τρεῖς ἀνάρχους. *apud. Coteler. Vol. 1. p. 449.*

‡ Οἱ μὲν γὰρ πλείους εἶναι θεοὺς λέγουσιν, οἱ δὲ τρεῖς ἀνάρχους οἱ δὲ ὁ αὐτογενήτης. *lib. 6. c. 10.*

that some of the *Simonian Gnostic Heretics* taught there were many Gods ; others that there were three unoriginated, and others that there were two unbegotten Persons (or Gods.) And \* *Origen* speaks of *Heretics* who dar'd to affirm two Gods : Such were the *Marcionites*.

But as the Heresy of *Ditheism* or *Tritheism* was more wicked and impure than any of the rest, and by immediate Consequence destroy'd not only the Divinity of the *Son*, but the Divinity of the one God, the *Father* also, and was no better than *Atheism* ; so it neither appear'd so openly as the others, and was soon quash'd and came to nothing ; and reviv'd not again till the latter End of the 4th Century, amongst some of the Followers of *Athanasius*.

That Dr. *Waterland's* Doctrine of the Trinity is in the strictest Sense *Tritheism*, I have fully prov'd in the foregoing Papers ; and that he teaches and avows the *Atheistical* and *diabolical* Doctrine (as the † *Apostolical Constitutions* call it) of three supreme, necessarily-existent, or unoriginated Persons, Agents or Gods, in as full and strong Terms as the *Simonian Gnostic Heretics* ever did, has been demonstrated from his many direct Assertions of this Doctrine ; and particularly, from his affirming it possible, that the *Son* might have been God the *Father*, and the *Father* have been the *Son*, and acted the ministerial Part : and that the three divine Persons differ in no essential Perfection ; but in mere Name or Mode of Existence : for a Mode of Existence which is not essential to the Deity, or is not an essential Perfection, is nothing more than a mere Name. And

\* Et duos quidem Deos aulos esse hæreticos dicere. Lib. 2. de Princip. c. 7.

† Lib. 6. c. 9, 10.



since the Reason and common Sense of all Mankind have ever taught them, that the *Nature* and all the *essential Perfections* of God are *unoriginated* and *underiv'd*; he whose avow'd Doctrine it is, that the *Son* and *Spirit* have the *Nature* and all the *essential Perfections* of the *one God and Father of all*, does, with the *Simonian Heretics*, professedly teach [*τρεῖς ἀνάρχος & ἀγεννήτως*] *three unoriginated or necessarily existent, unbegotten Persons, or Gods.*

This is the Doctrine which, with great Bitterness and Uncharitableness of Spirit, Dr. *W.* desires to impose upon the Professors of Christianity; otherwise wou'd exclude them (if he had competent Authority, p. 196.) from the Communion of the Christian Church. If this is not the *Spirit of Antichrist*, 'tis impossible to know what is. He has had sufficient means of Conviction laid before him, from *Scripture, Reason* and *Antiquity*: But *Scripture* is to be *perverted*, *Reason* is to be *degraded* and *abus'd* by *metaphysical Jargon*, and the Language of all the antient Fathers treated, as if their Words had no meaning at all, or meant the Reverse of what the same Words mean in all other Books whatsoever; and in short, all *Science* and all *Religion, natural and reveal'd*, is to give Way to an unreasonable and Antichristian Hypothesis: and this is the Sum of all Dr. *W.*'s Writings, and the great Business of his Life. Whoever opposes him must expect nothing but Rage and Rudeness; and tho' he ought long ago to have sat down in Shame and Silence, having been so often and thoroughly confuted; yet being gaul'd and griev'd to see *Truth* prevail and to have many Adherents; and that *Scripture, Reason* and *Antiquity*, speak all unanimously and loudly for his Adversaries, and as unanimously and loudly condemn him; he is resolv'd [so much is he set against the Truth] to try to discourage and quash it by  
humane

*humane Authority, and the Force of Church-censures: as if he thought there was no sense of Christian Liberty in the Governours of the Church; and that Popish Imposition and Tyranny might easily be introduc'd. But I hope he will find and feel that the more he pleads for humane Authority to impose the worst of Errors, the more he will only kick against the Pricks; that Truth will more and more prevail, till at last all Antichristian Doctrine and Imposition being banish'd out of the Christian Church, it will be without Spot or Wrinkle, and like a pure Virgin fit to be espous'd to Christ.*

**F I N I S.**



A Note to be added to P. 7. l. 37.

Dr. Waterland in his *second Defense* (p. 177.) says; "If you ask why that Person call'd the *Son*, might not have been *Father*; I have nothing to say, but that *in Fact* he is not——as to the *Son's* acting a *ministerial* Part, that indeed is purely *Oeconomical* [he means, is founded merely upon mutual Concert or Agreement] and there was no *Impossibility* in the Nature of the Thing, but the *Father* Himself might have done the same."

This Hypothesis of the *Dr's*, was charg'd with his supposing it possible, "that *unoriginate*, might have been *originate*, and *originate*, *unoriginate*; *deriv'd*, might have been *deriv'd*, and *deriv'd*, *deriv'd*; the *Father* might have been *begotten*, and the *Son* *unbegotten*." (*Observations on Dr. Waterland's second Defense*, p. 34, 35.) This is the plain unavoidable Consequence of what he allow'd; and it was necessary for the *Dr.* to say something to abate the Shockingness of it. Wherefore in a Book entitled, *a farther Vindication of Christ's Divinity*, p. 38. he pretends, with regard to the former Part of his Words, viz. *that the Son might have been Father*, seemingly to retract them, saying; *that the Priority of Order (that is the Originateness of the one, and Unoriginateness of the other) is natural, that is necessary, or unalterable, and eternally so.* In which Words he endeavours to evade the Charge above, both by a Contradiction, and really asserting what he had allow'd before. It is an evident Contradiction in the Terms, to say that the *Originateness* of the *Son* is *necessary*: this is still making *originate*, to be *unoriginate*; *deriv'd*, *underiv'd*; and the *Son* *unbegotten*. *Necessary Existence* is opposite to *Originated* (and therefore all the Antients constantly teach, that the *Son* was *originated* or *begotten* by the *Will* of the *Father*) and is the same as *Unoriginateness*; what is *necessary* (in se) in its Existence, cannot be *deriv'd*, or *originated*, or *begotten* from another. And that *Dr. W.* still means, that the *Son* is as really *unoriginated* as the *Father*, is evident, because he makes the *Unoriginateness* of the *Father*, a mere *Priority of Order*, without any Superiority of *Nature* or *Perfections*; and so a *Priority of Name* only, or the Order of placing the Words, *Father*, *Son*, *Spirit*; which is a Shameful Quibble. For 'tis his avow'd constant Doctrine, that the *Son* and *Spirit* are *the Substance of the Father*; and he disavows all *Difference of Nature, Substance, and Perfections*, amongst them. And to take away all possible and conceivable Distinction between the *Unoriginateness* of the *Father*, and *Originateness* of the *Son*; on which is founded the *Supremacy* of the one, and *Ministration* of the other; he affirms in the latter Part of his Words above cited, that the *Father* might have been sent, and have acted the *ministerial*



*nisterial Part*; that being, he says, purely *Oeconomical*, or by voluntary Agreement only; which in Consequence is allowing and affirming, that the *Father might have been the Son*: for the *Mission* and *ministerial Agency*, in the Sense of Scripture, and of the primitive Church, and in the Reason of Things, are founded in the *Filiation*, or in the natural *Originateness* of the *Son* by the *Will* of the *Father*; and are not compatible (nay were always thought *Impiety* and *Blasphemy* to be ascrib'd) to the *Unoriginated Nature* and *supreme Majesty* of God the *Father*.

---

## ERRATA.

**P**AGE 22. l. 18. for preverting read *perverting*. *ibid.* l. 29. for farther r. *for them*. p. 26. l. 34. del. comma after *those*. p. 29. l. 20. r. *was*. p. 33. l. 8. del. *and*. p. 40. l. 8. for complete r. *competent*. p. 56. l. 8. dele 1. p. 68. l. 5. r. *Father only*. p. 78. l. 9. r. *of the*. p. 91. l. penult. r. *ev*. p. 95. l. 3. r. *Father*. p. 96. l. ult. r. 3, 4, 6. p. 97. l. ult. r. *καὶ*. p. 99. l. 13. r. *by*. p. 122. l. 28. r. c. 15.

by  
ng  
ne  
nd  
re  
be  
ay  
to  
fa-

for  
of  
om-  
my  
and  
fem